Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BT 250 .N313 1880
Naville, Ernest, 1816-1909.
The Christ

Shelf....

THE CHRIST.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

THE CHRIST.

Seven Lectures

BY

ERNEST NAVILLE

(CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE OF FRANCE, ETC.), AUTHOR OF 'THE PROBLEM OF EVIL,' 'THE HEAVENLY FATHER,' ETC.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH

BY THE

REV. T. J. DESPRÉS.

'I wish to bring into evidence here only those foundations of the Christian Religion which are indubitable, and which cannot be called in question by anybody.'—PASCAL.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1880.

DEDICATION

To the Rev. WILLIAM BURT POPE, D.D.,

WESLEYAN MINISTER,

AND THEOLOGICAL TUTOR OF THE DIDSBURY WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

Dear and Honoured Sir,—Be pleased to do me the favour of accepting the dedication of this volume.

Though deprived, in the course of my ministerial education, of your theological learning and of your various scholastic attainments, your very valuable writings have been to me a veritable boon. This is especially true with respect to your masterly work on the Person of Christ.

When I undertook the translation of the present work, I determined to bring together the names of Dr. Pope and Ernest Naville. I could not carry out my intention except by using these means. Kindly accept the dedication of this translation as a token of my indebtedness and as a mark of my most profound respect.

May God greatly prolong your life, that you may continue to proclaim, by your spoken and written discourses, the unsearchable riches of Christ!

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours very respectfully,

THOS. JN. DESPRÉS.

ALLENDALE TOWN,
Oct. 1*st*, 1880.

SEMINARY

PREFACE.

THE Lectures contained in this volume are the sequel and the complement of those on *Eternal Life*, on *The Heavenly Father*, and on *The Problem of Evil*. They were delivered at Geneva, and afterwards at Lausanne, in the winter of 1877–78.

At Geneva a supplementary session was held for the purpose of replying to questions which had been put to me. One of these replies led me to discuss at greater length the relations of the Romish Church to freedom of worship. This I have published separately, because it was only indirectly related to the main subject of my Lectures.

ERNEST NAVILLE.

GENEVA, *September* 20, 1878.

CONTENTS.

FIRST LECTURE.

PAGE

State of the Question, ... 1

SECOND LECTURE.

Christ the Teacher, ... 26

THIRD LECTURE.

Christ the Comforter, ... 55

FOURTH LECTURE.

Christ the Redeemer, ... 86

FIFTH LECTURE.

Christ the Legislator, ... 113

SIXTH LECTURE.

Christ the Lord, ... 144

SEVENTH LECTURE.

Conclusion, ... 177

Questions and Answers, ... 213

THE CHRIST.

FIRST LECTURE.

The State of the Question.

GENTLEMEN,—On a certain day, approximately fixed by chronology at the thirtieth year of our era, Jesus, a young Israelitish carpenter, already famous in His country, spake to some of His fellow-countrymen who had become His followers, and asked them: 'Whom say the people that I am?' (Luke ix. 18–20). They told Him of the various rumours in circulation, when Simon, a boatman of Galilee, better known afterwards by the name of Peter, answered and said: 'Thou art the Christ of God' (Luke ix. 20). He meant to say: 'Thou art He that should come, and whom we expected.' The fact is, that at that time of which we speak, the Jews, relying on ancient writings which they regarded as prophecies, expected a great personage, a liberator, a teacher who should instruct them, and re-establish the glory of the people of Israel, then subject to the Roman yoke. This expected liberator was designated in Greek by the name of Christ, in Hebrew by that of the Messiah.

What did the carpenter of Nazareth say of Himself? We shall learn this from an incident selected from

many others. In one of His journeys He stayed two days in a town of Samaria called Sychar. During that time He conversed with the inhabitants, and at the end of His brief sojourn they said of Him: 'We have heard Him, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world' (John iv. 42). The question is no longer that of the liberation of the people of Israel alone, but of a work directed to the whole world, and that work, a work of salvation. Jesus stated that this work of salvation was the work of God, whom He called His Father; and those who received His word, and became His disciples, made profession of a faith which may be summed up thus: '*In Jesus, the carpenter of Nazareth, a work of God is being accomplished for the salvation of the world.*' Such is faith in Christ in its living germ.

There is no need for me to recount the sequel of a history which is the best known of all histories. Multitudes follow Jesus with enthusiasm. The rulers of the people and the chief priests, menaced in their power, league themselves against Him. Another crowd than that which had received Him with acclamation (alas! it may have been the same), with great entreaty demand His death at the hands of the Roman governor. Pride and envy accuse Him, avarice betrays Him, cowardice surrenders Him; He is nailed to a cross,—a kind of punishment reserved to wretches who were not merely condemned to death, but to ignominy. His dejected disciples are scattered, but soon they re-assemble, full of courage. They announce that their

Master is risen from the dead, and that He has commanded them to teach all nations. They publish the word of salvation, affirming that 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself' (2 Cor. v. 19). Then this question is asked in the Roman empire: 'What think ye of the Christ?' On this subject two currents of opinion are formed. Those who admit the reality of salvation by Christ, unite together and form the assembly of believers,—the Church,—which places her trust in the Saviour, in whom she believes, for life, for death, and for immortality. On the other hand, a formidable opposition arises in the bosom of ancient society, which feels its bases threatened. The priests, the governments, the philosophers, join in a common attack upon the new doctrine. In that attack we may discern two elements,—hatred of dangerous innovators, contempt for the disciples of the Crucified. For some the gospel (that was the name of the new doctrine) is especially a peril; for others, it is altogether a folly.

This was the way in which the question presented itself in the Roman world. It presents itself in the same way in our days, and of all the questions which agitate men this is the most universal. The inhabitants of the earth are visibly tending to organize themselves into unity, and their views and interests are becoming every day more general. In the fifteenth century, the populations of America were engaged in frightful wars, of which Europe knew no more about than if they had taken place on another planet; while

our generation, with the most lively sympathies, associated itself with the war that abolished negro slavery in the United States. Let there be an earthquake or a political revolution at the other extremity of the globe in the morning, and in the evening we are informed of it by telegraph. The community of human minds has therefore made great progress. Nevertheless the Chinese discuss many questions which are unknown to us; and Europeans excite themselves in social and political conflicts, which are absolutely unknown to the teeming populations of Africa and Asia. But the question proposed eighteen centuries ago, first in Palestine, then in the Roman empire: 'What must be thought of Christ?' this question is now asked all over the world. It is eagerly discussed in the various countries of Europe; it is presented to the Brahmins of India, on the banks of the Ganges, and on the slopes of the Himalayas; it reaches the ears of those who inhabit the tropics, as also of the dwellers by the northern seas, and it is a subject of much thought in the most distant isles of the ocean. It is no longer in the narrow circle of Palestine only, or in the vaster circle of the Roman empire, but in the whole world, that Christ might ask to-day: 'Whom say the people that I am?'

In order to rightly understand the import of the study that we are entering upon, let us weigh the terms of the question stated, and see what it supposes. The question is that of a work of God for the salvation of the world. A *work of God* supposes a God capable

of acting, a living God, the Master of His works, and able to intervene in the course of events. The *salvation of the world* supposes a world which needs to be saved; the idea of salvation always answers to that of an evil to be repaired, or of a danger to be prevented. The problem which we are approaching is not proposed, therefore, either for those who deny the existence of a living God, or for those who deem that the world is in order, and that there is nothing in human nature to be repaired.

I have treated these preliminary questions in two series of lectures,—the one on 'the Heavenly Father,' and the other on 'the Problem of Evil.' I take the liberty of referring you to these two volumes, wishing you to observe that, in order to approach the study of the question of salvation, it is not necessary to admit the theoretical solution that I have proposed for the problem of evil, a solution of the difficulties of which I am not unmindful; it suffices to admit that the world, as we know it, is not in order, and that it needs restoration.

The assertion of the divine mission of Christ is common to all Christendom. However opposed the various Churches may be to each other on other points, they are agreed on this, if they are Churches at all, that is to say, congregations of believers. It is this common faith which geographically separates Christian from non-Christian lands; and in countries that are Christian outwardly, it is this common faith which separates the Churches from civil society, where, under

the *régime* of liberty, every man has the right of expressing his opinions. There exists, then, amid all the diversity of their opinions, an affirmation common to all Christians. This truth is as easy to establish as it is important. Speak to a Roman Catholic who has reflected on the basis of his belief. Ask him why he submits to the decisions of the Pope. He will rest the authority of the Pope on that of the Council; the authority of the Council on that of the Church, of which the Council is the voice; the authority of the Church on that of the apostles, who founded it; the authority of the apostles on that of Jesus Christ, who sent them forth; and, finally, the authority of Jesus Christ on that of God, who in Him was manifested to the world. Such will be the necessary chain of his arguments. Let us now enter into that Oriental building, which, on the *Plateau des Tranchées*,[1] causes the gilded domes which surmount it to glitter in the sunshine. There we will find Russians, Greeks, Roumanians, united for their common worship. These Christians do not recognise the supreme authority of the Pope and the validity of the Western Councils, but they admit the decisions of the Councils anterior to the schism which has separated the East from the West. Why do they receive those decisions? They will answer you by passing from the Œcumenical Councils to the Church, from the Church to the apostles, from the apostles to Christ, from Christ to God. And the Protestant, who draws his belief

[1] In Geneva.

directly from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament? To justify the authority that he allows to these books, he will be obliged to bring in the Church which formed the canon of Scripture, the apostles who founded the Church, Jesus Christ who chose the apostles, God who manifested Himself in Jesus Christ. Allow me to use a comparison borrowed from geometry. The various Christian communities are placed on divers points of a circumference. But these points, even the most opposite, are the extremities of rays which all terminate at the same centre; that centre is Christ, the work of God in Christ. All controversy, ecclesiastical and confessional, turns on the legitimate interpretation of the word and work of Christ, and supposes faith in the divinity of that work. It is true that, in the social conflicts in which religion is engaged, one meets with fervent Catholics and zealous Protestants, of whom one might be sometimes allowed to ask whether either the one or the other believe even in God. We must be very sparing of judgments on the conscience of our neighbour. But if there be men who place a heaven in which they believe not at the service of earth; if there be men who, under the cloak of religion, pursue only the satisfaction of their interests and passions; if there be men who desecrate that which ought to be for ever sacred, by making of their religious belief a mere everyday political tool,—those men do an injury to society; those men are turning back the best of the currents of modern civilisation; and, to

speak out all my mind, they are guilty of a real profanation.

Let me be clearly understood. In taking my stand on ground so general as that which I have chosen, I do not mean to propose that we shall found a new religion on the sole basis of faith in Christ. Neither do I dream of forming the project of an external reunion of the various Churches. Nothing could be more conformable to my wishes than such a reunion, but nothing, for the moment, is further from my hopes. Simple faith in Christ is a germ whose development naturally produces a determination of doctrine and a Church organization. In the present state of things, that development produces divisions and conflicts. I do not dispute the lawfulness of these conflicts; but my purpose is to stop at the unity of the common faith, without entering into the diversity of its interpretations. The question is of sufficient importance to be treated separately. I shall not attack, then, either the Pope of Rome, or the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the holy Synod of Russia, or the Anglican Bishops, or the Lutheran Consistories, or—in short, gentlemen, I shall not enter into any polemics, ecclesiastical or confessional. Elsewhere you may hear more than enough about that which divides Christians; it will perhaps please you, if only for the novelty of the thing, to listen to nothing in this place but about that which should unite them.

The question that I am approaching is not that of deciding which among the Christian Churches is the

best, or the alone good; but to inquire whether all the Churches must perish in a common shipwreck, which would leave nothing floating on the destructive waves of the ocean save the negation of all Christian belief. The question that I am approaching is not that of deciding which is the most faithful expression and the most correct interpretation of the work of Jesus Christ; but to inquire if this name, which has wiped the tear from so many eyes, and called forth so many acts of devotion,—the name of Jesus,—must henceforth be banished from the family as it is from the elementary school, to figure no longer except in the researches of *savants* and of historians. From the social point of view, the question now before me is whether our civilisation must continue to develope the germs which gave it birth, and of which it is so far from having seen the full expansion; or whether the modern nations, violently uprooted from the moral soil by which they are borne up, must be whirled into an unknown future, on the threshold of which one can scarcely help foreseeing anything but clouds and storms.

The question, disengaged from every confessional element, shall also be cleared from all special dogmatics. By special dogmatics, I mean not those doctrines that relate to the presence of God in Jesus Christ, which is the foundation of the faith, but those which relate to the mode of that presence,—for example, the systems relating to the Incarnation and to the holy Trinity. Just as faith in Christ is the necessary basis of all con-

fessional controversy, so is it the necessary basis of all dogmatics in the sense that I have just pointed out. The question of the divine nature of Christ can be approached without entering into the examination of those doctrines which define it; but the converse does not hold good. It is evident that one cannot study the mode of the presence of God in Jesus, if one does not admit the reality of that presence.

Lastly, we shall keep outside of all scientific researches relative to textual criticism. This demands somewhat lengthy explanations, especially for those Protestants who have been in the habit of considering the divinity of the Scriptures as the direct object of their faith, and as the first article of their creed. How can we approach the study of the Christian religion, even in the most general sense of the word, whilst eliminating that critical science which determines our opinion of the value and nature of the first documents of that religion?

I will first ask you to observe that my study will not be limited to facts contained in the Books of the New Testament; far from that, I intend to use facts which have occurred in the course of eighteen centuries, and contemporary facts which every one can test without the aid of the researches of *savants*. For a long time one has been in a complete uncertainty as to the sources of the Nile. But that uncertainty did not prevent men from stating that the periodical overflowing of its waters produced the fertility of Egypt. In the same way, one can study the effects of the

Christian religion in the world without solving the scientific questions to which its written documents give rise. It is important, in the next place, to notice that the New Testament presents itself under two different aspects. At first view, it is a collection of historical documents analogous to all others. One must indeed begin there! The authority of Jesus Christ will establish for the Christian the authority of the texts; but, how think you that the authority of the texts can establish that of Jesus Christ? That was possible for the Jews, who admitted the Old Testament to which Christ referred them in justification of His mission; but this is manifestly impossible for any one who does not admit the value of the Old Testament and the reality of the prophecies. The fellow-countrymen of Jesus could pass from the book to Christ; we, on the contrary, can only determine the value of the book by passing to it through Christ.

In studying the New Testament merely as a historical document, a certain number of facts are ascertained which cannot be denied without denying all history. When these facts have been recognised, together with the facts unfolded in the course of eighteen centuries, the question presents itself: 'What must be thought of Christ?' According to the answer given, the volume of documents is approached from two opposite standpoints. Has the question been answered by denying the special presence of God in Jesus Christ? then every supernatural element must be removed from the text. Is a work of God in Jesus Christ

admitted? then the supernatural elements contained in the text will occasion no difficulty. He who believes in the divine mission of Christ will have no difficulty in admitting that, by the circumstances of His nativity, He was screened from the corruption of ordinary generations; that, in the course of His life, He displayed a superhuman power; and that He came forth from the sepulchre the conqueror of death. Science will retain all her rights for the study of the value of texts and documents; but she will no longer be governed by a spirit of negation. There is not, then, one criticism, but two. The one rests upon a basis of belief, the other on a basis of negation; and these two bases are not the result of the detailed studies of the texts, but of two contrary principles which inspire those studies.

Do not imagine that I want to eulogize the theology of ignorant men! Some time ago we had, in Geneva, a translation of the Psalms, which in certain places was very defective in a poetical point of view, and which had been several times revised by a company of pastors. On the occasion of one of these revisions, a woman from the country indignantly exclaimed one day: 'Do these gentlemen really pretend to know French better than King David?' I have selected an extreme example; but it would be possible to cite many others. Christians of both sexes often compromise their cause by wishing to decide, in the name of their faith, questions which belong to science. Science has her province. Let us beware of entering

upon it unless we are lawfully qualified; but for the fundamentals, for the essentials, for the principles which turn science into two opposite directions, for the faith properly so called, the springs of life do not flow from the dust of libraries and the quibbles of the school. The Father of mankind has not permitted in His family a privilege so monstrous. The part to be taken with respect to the nature of Christ's work, cannot be decided by textual criticism or by erudition. In this connection there are believers quite as learned as unbelievers, and unbelievers quite as learned as believers. I am aware that both parties deny this; but to deny it, on either side, seems to me to be either the result of a blind prejudice, or an act of haughty insolence.

The volume of the Scriptures presents itself, then, under two different aspects. It is simply a historical document, or it is a document which faith invests with a special authority. This second point of view cannot be ours. The divine mission of Christ being admitted, what result will this admission have upon the Book? This is a question of special dogmatics, which some men will resolve by their adherence to the teaching of their Church, and some others by their personal researches. We shall not approach it; we cannot, since it takes as solved the question which is to be the sole object of our research. We shall therefore keep outside of all questions of learned criticism, as well as of all confessional conflicts and dogmatic determinations. This will be the course of our study:—

Christ is affirmed as a Saviour. Salvation is deliverance from evil under all its forms. Without separating what should remain united, one may yet distinguish divers elements in the general idea of a deliverance. We shall study the work of Christ in its relations with the researches of reason (Christ the Teacher), with the sufferings of the heart (Christ the Comforter), with the troubles of the conscience (Christ the Redeemer), with the course of society (Christ the Legislator). After that we shall fix our attention on the power which He has manifested in all respects (Christ the Lord). After having collected all the data, we shall seek the best explanation of them, or, to speak more correctly, I shall submit to your notice the solution which I am here to defend, that of Christendom, that is to say, that in Jesus of Nazareth, become the Christ, a work of God has been accomplished for the salvation of the world.

Before going any further, permit me one remark with respect to the nature of my exposition. Religious speech assumes two different forms,—sometimes it is the word of the Church, and at other times it is what I shall call the word of the public place. The Apostle Paul, speaking or writing to the religious communities which had accepted his preaching, addresses them with authority. He reminds them of the faith received, explains it, applies it, censures those who deviate from it. That is what I call the word of the Church; it presupposes a previous faith, common to him who speaks and to those who hear. But here is this same

Paul on the public place at Athens. No common faith unites him to the citizens of that town, to the philosophers that accost him, and to the curious who gather round him. He states his belief, and discusses it without his hearers being able to attach any authority to his discourses. Such is the word of the public place; and it is that which I intend you to hear in this hall.

I presume that no one will dispute the importance of the question we are now approaching, whether for the individual or for society. Firstly, for the individual: Those who believe know well what they possess. Those who do not believe, if they are men of serious minds, know well what they might obtain by believing. Those who doubt, do not deny the gravity of the problem that they raise, but cannot solve. And, lastly, those who have ceased to believe, endeavour to account, and often with sadness, for what they have lost. In the present state of men's minds, the separation of thought from Christ often involves the destruction of every religious element. I do not say that this is always the case; I state a fact, and I say that it is thus in a large number of cases. Here is an example: A young man, native of the Jura, and who became an esteemed philosopher,—I allude to Jouffroy,—had been brought up in a pious family. He has made known the religious feelings of his childhood in the following words:—'The present life was clear to me, and beyond it I saw the future unfolding itself without a cloud. Clear as to the

course which I had to pursue in this world, perfectly at ease as to the end to which it would conduct me in the other; comprehending life in its two aspects, and death which unites them; comprehending myself, knowing God's designs concerning me, and loving Him for the goodness of those designs,—I was happy with that joy which results from a living and unhesitating faith in a doctrine which solves all the great problems which can interest the mind of man.'

Sent to Paris, Jouffroy enters the Normal School. Under the influence of the spirit that reigned in that school, he begins to feel doubts arising in his mind concerning the divine worth of Christianity; and—this is the fact to which I draw your attention—doubt as to his Christian faith disturbs and uproots at one stroke all his religious beliefs. Let us hear him:—'Never shall I forget the December evening when the veil which hid my unbelief from mine own eyes was torn away. I still hear my footsteps in that narrow and empty room, where, long after the hour for sleep, I was accustomed to promenade; I still see that moon, half veiled by clouds, which at intervals lit up the cold pavement. The hours of the night glided away, and I perceived it not; I anxiously followed my thought, which descended step by step to the bottom of my consciousness, and, dissipating one after another all the illusions which till then had hid them from my view, rendered its subterfuges more and more visible to me. In vain I clung to my last beliefs, as a ship-wrecked sailor to the fragments of his ship; in vain,

terrified by the unknown waste in which I was about to float, I threw myself back once more upon my childhood, my family, my country, all that was dear and sacred to me; the inflexible current of my thought was the stronger; parents, family, memories, beliefs, it forced me to leave all. This examination became more obstinate and more severe as it approached the end; nor did it stop until the end was reached. I knew then that at the bottom of myself there was nothing left standing, that *all I had believed about myself, about God, and about my destiny in this life and in that to come, I now believed no more.* This moment was frightful; and when, towards morning, I threw myself exhausted upon my bed, it seemed to me as if I could feel my former life, so cheerful and so complete, die away, and before me there opened up another life, dark and dispeopled, where henceforth I was to live alone, alone with my fatal thought which had just exiled me thither, and which I was tempted to curse.'[1]

Such may be, for the individual, the importance of the question on the nature of Christ. Its importance is not less for society.

Whence comes our civilisation? Without alluding to our remote Asiatic origin, where the human species seem to have been cradled, modern civilisation is like unto a river into which Greece, Rome, and Germany

[1] See *Les nouveaux mélanges philosophiques* of Theodore Jouffroy, published by Damiron, pp. 112-115; and the journal *Le Semeur* for Dec. 1842, which restored a passage omitted by M. Damiron.

have poured their streams as tributaries, which have oft swollen and troubled its waters; but the principal source of the river is in Judea. The most considerable influence exercised upon our laws, our customs, our morals, our ideas, is the influence, direct or indirect, of the gospel. Do you wish to account for this? Do not consult apologists whom you may suspect, but men who in their special studies have found a truth which they were not seeking. For the laws, consult the works of Montesquieu, or the more recent writings of Troplong.[1] 'Tis not only Châteaubriand, in his *Génie du Christianisme*, but also Töpffer, in his *Réflexions et menus propos d'un peintre genevois*,[2] who will tell you, with many others, what has been the influence of Christianity on the arts. Rossi will show you that same influence acting upon political economy.[3] I limit myself to these rapid references, which it would be easy to extend and multiply. We have all been trained under the influence of Christian ideas, whence two delusions running in an opposite direction. It often happens that we take for specifically Christian elements human actions which result from the natural development of the heart, of the reason, and of the conscience. It also happens, and perhaps more frequently still, that we take for natural and human things specifically Christian. In order to

[1] *De l'influence du Christianisme sur le droit privé des Romains*, 1842; *De l'influence du Christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains*, 1843; seconde edition, 1855.

[2] Vol. i. pp. 127–130.

[3] *Bibliothèque universelle* of Dec. 1867, pp. 503–505.

be cured of this double error, we must open the volume of history, and read the accounts of travellers who have visited nations where the influence of the gospel was altogether unknown. When that is done, we shall understand that underneath political, social, and economic questions, there lies this other, deeper question, which contains in germ the solution of the others, 'What must be thought of Christ?' It will then be seen what an abyss would open up were every Christian influence destroyed; one would then see distinctly that to suppress the gospel, and the rays of the gospel which reach those who do not accept its directer light, even those who despise or hate that light, would be not only to remove one of the stones of modern civilisation, but to pull out the corner-stone, and bring about the total fall and ruin of the edifice.

The study which we are approaching is therefore very important; I add that it is very actual. The faith of Christians has always been contested, but in various degrees and in different ways. In the sixteenth century, for example, there were minds thoroughly hostile to every religious doctrine; but the great discussions of that epoch, those which rent Western society, related to the *mode* of interpreting the work of Christ, and not to the *value* of that work. Then, the civil liberty of opinion being altogether wanting, absolute negations could not be openly avowed in Geneva any more than in Rome. In our days, and in most modern states, the most radical negations can show themselves in broad daylight.

They are publicly set forth; they have at their service books, newspapers, and organized societies. The sources of these negations are numerous; I will rapidly enumerate a few of them.

Firstly, the enemy of all religious culture, the ancient materialism. Fifty years ago it was thought to be pretty nearly dead, or at the least decaying; but it has come to life again; it has assumed a very high tone, and seeks in the physical and natural sciences a prop which it thinks firm, though it is not.

Secondly, historical criticism. The distinction that I have established between the proper domain of this science and the bases of faith is generally ignored. It is too often imagined that by taking off the moss and the mistletoe from the trunk and branches of the tree of religion, the sources of its life are affected.

Thirdly, the relatively new science of comparative religions. A child who has never left his father's home naturally enough considers his village to be the world, the limits of his horizon as the boundaries of the universe, the customs of his family and of his country as the laws of mankind. When he becomes aware of the existence of other peoples, other manners, other laws, he sometimes receives a violent mental shock. Just in this way we begin very naturally by believing that our religion is *the* religion. Do we take cognizance of other religions? They abound in superstitions, often in most monstrous practices; but an impartial study will enable us to discover in them also a portion of truth, greater than we thought of

finding at first. We thus discover that we do not possess the absolute monopoly of the true and the good. This brings one over to the idea that each people has its own religion, and that all religions may be equally good in their time and place; an idea which would lead men to divest Jesus Christ of His character of Saviour, in order to set Him up in a sort of Pantheon with Confucius, Zoroaster, and Sakya-Mûni.

Fourthly, politics. Civil powers have imposed religion by sheer force; hence we have in history a lugubrious procession of persecutions, massacres, and martyrdoms. This state of things has produced a reaction, which is legitimate in its principle, but which is becoming blind in its excess. From the just idea that the temporal power ought not to be at the command of the clergy, men pass to the absolutely different idea, that it is necessary to suppress the social influence of religion.. The use is proscribed from fear of the abuse. This is to reason as men would do, who, in order to prevent conflagrations, would propose to deprive mankind of that fire which warms and illumines it. This confusion of ideas arises from the double sense attached to the term *laic*. Men speak of lay society, lay schools, lay teaching. What do they mean? Two things absolutely different. Some mean that in the present conditions of society, with its diversity of religions and its liberty of opinions, state matters should be distinct from those of the Church. I am of this opinion, and I am of this opinion in the

interests of religion just as much as in the interests of the state. In this sense *laic* is a term opposed to the idea of the temporal power of the clergy. But others take the word in a quite different sense. For them *laic* signifies without religion. That is certain. Get the men who demand in common the lay state, the lay school, to explain themselves, and you will soon see that, while agreeing as to the word, they utterly disagree as to the thing. Some employ the word in its true and traditional sense, others in a new sense, born of present passions and conflicts. On this subject I will make a single observation. Gentlemen (I address myself to fathers of families), when you speak to your child about God, about the Saviour, about the home where we hope to find again those whom we have lost, do you then cease to be laymen? Do you admit that religion is the monopoly of the clergy?

Fifthly, evil socialism. I say *evil*. If by socialism be meant efforts made, not only to change the hands which hold power, the proper business of the politician, but also to ameliorate the condition of society, to diminish the sources of misery, to obtain a better distribution of the products of labour, this socialism is good, it is Christian in its spirit and in its origin. Evil socialism is that which despises liberty, which would make men into mere machines, which aspires to overturn institutions by violence, and which seeks its fulcrum in the passions and the lusts which it summons to the pursuit (*curée*) of the good things of this world. This kind of socialism looks upon Christ as an obstacle,

and upon God as an adversary. This fact is pointed out by Alfred de Musset. Alluding to certain writers who accuse the gospel of having been a principle of dissolution for Roman society, he writes: 'Christianity ruined the emperors, but it saved the people. It opened the palace of Constantinople to the barbarians, but it also opened the cottage doors to the consoling angels of Christ. . . . That is what Christianity did; and now, after so many years, what have they done who tried to destroy it? They have seen that the poor allowed themselves to be oppressed by the rich, the feeble by the strong, for the very reason that they said to themselves, "The rich and the mighty may oppress me on the earth, but when they would enter into Paradise, I shall be standing at the gate, and I will accuse them at the bar of God." Thus, alas! they learned patience. The antagonists of Christ have therefore said to the poor, "Thou art patient till the day of judgment: there is no day of judgment; thou waitest for eternal life to claim thy revenge: there is no eternal life; thou treasurest up thy tears and the tears of thy family, the cries of thy children and the sighs of thy wife, in order to carry them to the feet of God at the hour of thy death: there is no God." Then the poor man has determinedly wiped away his tears, he has bidden his wife be silent, and his children to come along with him, and has stood his ground with the force of a bull. He has said to the rich, "Thou that hast oppressed me art but a man;" and to the priest, "Thou that hast consoled me hast

lied." That was just what the antagonists of Christ desired. It may be that they thought they were promoting the happiness of men by sending forth the poor to the conquest of liberty. . . . No doubt you are philanthropists, no doubt you are right as to the future, and the day will come when men will bless you; but not yet, verily we cannot yet bless you. Formerly, when the oppressor said, "The earth for me!" the oppressed answered, "Heaven for me!" What will he answer now?'[1]

These strong words point out a real fact: evil socialism is one of the elements in the present struggle against Christ, and swells the ranks of the adversaries of the gospel.

Those are many hostile forces mustering from various quarters. Christianity is like a fortress against which armies are advancing from all the points of the horizon. What are they doing inside the fortress? Alas! exactly what the Jews did during the siege of Jerusalem. The Roman armies surrounded the city, and three rival factions added intestine dissensions and quarrels to the horrors of the most frightful of sieges. Such is the too faithful image of Christendom in our days.

At the commencement of the present century, after the attacks of the Encyclopædists upon the foundations of all religious belief, after the days of the Terror, when the members of all the Churches, without distinction, were thrown into prison, and led away to the guillotine, a marked reconciliation was effected between

[1] *La confession d'un enfant du siècle,* chap. ii.

the two branches of Western Christendom. The common attack and the community of the persecution had rendered Protestants and Catholics attentive to that which united them. To-day the attacks are not less violent, the danger to the faith is not less great, and no reconcilement is effected. Never had Christians more need to be united, and never were they more divided! One understands the triumphant shouts of the adversaries, the anxiety of many believers, and all the actuality of the subject of my lectures.

Such is the study that I propose to you. It was not without hesitation, and, to employ a term that does not exceed the real fact of the case, it was not without anxiety that I decided to enter upon it. I know, I feel deeply what I lack, in many ways, to be a workman worthy of the task I have undertaken. I have seriously asked myself whether I do not run the risk of compromising by my insufficiency the cause I wish to serve. You have not, then, before you a teacher speaking with authority, but merely a student bringing to you, for your consideration, the result of his researches. Independently of the conclusions to which I wish to lead you, however, it seems to me that I shall not have done a useless work if I succeed momentarily in turning away your thoughts from the preoccupations of ordinary life, from the conflicts, often fruitless and painful, of politics, and from the still more painful ecclesiastical and confessional conflicts, in order to place you face to face with the religious question approached in its largest and most serious sense.

SECOND LECTURE.

Christ the Teacher.

GENTLEMEN, — Christopher Columbus left the coasts of Spain on the 3d of August 1492, and on the 4th of March 1493, tempest-tossed, he cast anchor at the mouth of the Tagus. If the tempest had engulphed his vessel, and if Columbus had swum alone to the shores of Portugal, on hearing the strange things that he related, there would not have been wanting persons who would have applied to him the proverb, 'They lie best who come from far.' But before the astonished gaze of those who visited his ship, he exhibited the plants, the animals, and lastly the inhabitants of the new world that he had discovered. At these signs they regarded him as a witness worthy of credence, and they accepted his word. In the story which bears the title of *The Gospel according to St. John*, we read that a Jew named Nicodemus came to Jesus, and said unto Him, 'Rabbi, we know that Thou art a Teacher come from God: for no man can do those miracles that Thou doest, except God be with him' (John iii. 1, 2). In the thought of this Jew, Jesus wrought works which

justified the title that He assumed of the witness to 'heavenly things,' and in virtue of which He taught with authority (John iii. 11, 32, viii. 14, xii. 49, 50, xviii. 37). The Portuguese believed the word of Columbus, because he appeared to them to offer valid proofs of his credibility as a witness on the subject of America; Nicodemus believed the word of Jesus, because He appeared to him to offer valid proofs of His credibility as a witness of heavenly things. Such is the position of faith. This attitude of the mind cannot exist in any case save as the result of our own research; to wish to take it at its outset would constitute a grave error of reasoning. From the standpoint of faith, whether the question have reference to things human or to things divine, the nature of the witness determines the value of the testimony. From the standpoint of research, which is ours, the nature of the testimony is one of the elements of the estimate of the witness.

We have therefore to consider Jesus simply as a Teacher, to study His word apart from all opinions as to His origin. On what shall we interrogate this Teacher? On the highest question which the human intellect can ask—on the origin of the universe. The colossal mountains and the elevated table-lands of Asia divide waters, some of which, after irrigating the fertile plains of India, pour themselves into the warm seas of the south; while the others, after traversing the cold steppes of Siberia, pass on to feed the eternal ice-seas of the north. So in doctrinal matters there

are summits where the thoughts of men are divided. Among these summits, the highest is the question of the origin of the universe. According to the answer given, all the ideas take a different course. At the time when Christ appeared, there existed four principal doctrines relative to this great problem: Polytheism, Dualism, Pantheism, and Materialism.

Polytheism, that is to say, the doctrine which attributes the origin of the world to multiple powers, a doctrine under the influence of which men addressed their homages and prayers to different deities. In the Greek and Roman world this was the doctrine of the people, and if not of the rulers themselves, who oft had no faith in it, at least of the governments.

Dualism refers the origin of the world to two principles. These two principles are that of good and that of evil; or, in another form of the same doctrine, an eternal mind and an eternal matter. This system under its first form had its centre in Persia. Under its second form it existed, more or less attenuated and veiled, but at the same time real, among the greatest philosophers of Greece.

Materialism would explain all things—the thoughts of the mind as well as the combinations of matter, the feelings of the heart as well as the movements of the body—by the alone conjunction of atoms. This doctrine is met with in all lands and in all ages. It is the natural product of reason in its infancy. Materialism will never absolutely disappear until the general intellectual level of mankind rises so high that no one

will any longer confound the properties of matter and the attributes of mind.

Lastly, Pantheism is the doctrine which affirms that God is everything, or that everything is God (such is the meaning of the word), that is to say, that the principle of the universe, destitute of consciousness and of liberty, manifests itself according to a fatal law, and exhausts itself in the production of nature and of humanity. This system appears to have originated in India and in the Greek colonies of the south of Italy.

Polytheism, Dualism, Pantheism, Materialism: such were the four principal conceptions (I say not unique) as to the origin of the universe current in the ancient world.

What is the doctrine of Jesus on this subject? It is Monotheism, that is to say, the affirmation that the universe was created by a God unique, in whose work, power, wisdom, and goodness are indivisibly combined. God is one; and in thinking of His supreme unity we ought never to isolate the three elements which constitute it. God is powerful, He is wise, and He is good. This doctrine was taken for granted by Jesus, who completes rather than expounds it. In fact, He spoke to Israelites who had already received it. His great work, from the point of view of the theory of the origin of the world, is to have diffused all over the globe the truth of which the people of Israel had the *dépôt*, to have made the God of Abraham and of Moses the God of all mankind. Moses had given laws to a small

nation; Jesus sends His disciples forth to teach *all* nations, and to communicate to them what is more than laws, a new spirit.

The doctrine of the one God, powerful, wise, and good, is the fundamental basis of Christian teaching. When the preachers of the gospel went forth into the world, they found in the chief centres of the ancient civilisation groups of Israelites. They spoke to them just as Jesus had spoken to His hearers, because they all alike admitted the existence of the God of Abraham and of Moses; but here is Paul at Athens. He cannot assume that Monotheism is accepted by the inhabitants of this city, and he is called upon by the curious Athenians to expound the groundwork of his preaching: 'May we know,' say they, 'what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest is? for thou bringest certain strange things to our ears' (Acts xvii. 19, 20). The apostle satisfies their desire. A numerous assembly gathers round him. Where does he begin the exposition of his faith? In this city, full of idols, he announces the unique and Almighty Creator, He who has made all things, 'in Whom we live, and move, and have our being' (Acts xvii. 22–28). These thoughts were new for the Athenians. They are familiar to us; how were they spread abroad in the world?

Here is the principal affirmation of this evening's discourse. Carefully examine whether it be possible to disprove it: *Monotheism in a pure state, and as a doctrine generally taught, does not exist in the world save under the influence of Christian preaching.* Such is my

thesis. Here is the proof of it: Take a map of the world, and draw the chart of the countries in which the doctrine of the unity of God is generally taught, to the exclusion of all idolatry. Draw up a second chart; that of the countries under the influence of Christian preaching. Compare the two charts; they will be identical. The chart of the countries where the unity of God is generally taught, and the map of the countries brought under the influence of Christian preaching, are the same chart. In fact, the unity of God is generally and publicly taught only among Jews, Mahometans, and Christians. From our present point of view, what are the Jews? The ancestors of the Christians. It was them who, by Jesus Christ, transmitted to us the doctrine which we are considering. What are the Mahometans? The struggles between the Crescent and the Cross, which have been the cause of so much bloodshed, and which at this very moment crimsons the soil of Europe and of Asia, may create an illusion and lead to the belief that, from the first, the doctrine of Mahomet was absolutely opposed to the teaching of Christ. This was not the case. Mahometanism dates from the seventh century of our era; this date alone proves that its doctrine of the unity of God was drawn from Jewish and Christian traditions. Independently of this historical evidence, this fact is established by the most express declarations of Mahomet himself. I open the Koran.[1] There I find that the God which

[1] Koran signifies *reading*. The Mahometans call their sacred writings *al Koran*, the Reading, the Reading *par excellence*; just as the Christians

it proclaims is the God of Abraham, of whom Mahomet considers himself the most faithful continuator.[1] I read: 'I am not the only apostle that has ever lived. . . . Before the Koran, there existed the book of Moses, which was given to be the guide of men and the proof of the goodness of God. The Koran confirms it in the Arabic, in order that the wicked may be warned and that the virtuous learn good tidings.'[2]

Mahomet admits the divine mission of the Hebrew prophets, the mission and even the supernatural conception of Jesus.[3] Finally, he rises to this thought of union: 'Say to the Jews and to the Christians, O ye who have received the Scriptures, let us come to an understanding. Let us worship God alone, and let us not associate other lords with Him.'[4]

Such are the words of the prophet of Mecca. It is thus that he establishes the genealogy of Monotheism, the origin of which he attributes to Abraham, to Moses, to the prophets, and to Jesus. It is true that the doctrine of the Koran as a whole is strongly opposed to that of the gospel; but so far as the subject of our present study is concerned, Mahometanism is but a detached branch of Jewish and Christian Monotheism.

I repeat it, therefore: the chart of the countries in which Monotheism is generally taught, and the chart of the countries under the influence, direct or indirect,

call the Old and New Testaments *the Bible*, i.e. *the Book*, the Book *par excellence*.

[1] Cf. *Sura*, iii. 58–60.
[2] *Ibid.* xlvi. 8–11.
[3] *Ibid.* iii. 40, 42, 179, 180.
[4] *Ibid.* iii. 57.

of Christian preaching, exactly coincide. This is, for my thesis, a geographical demonstration within the reach of all.

But you will perhaps say, Did not the sages of Greece often speak of the only God? Do not first-class savants tell us that they find the idea of the unity of God at the base of all the great religions of the ancient world, and that idolatry is a corruption of primitive dogmas? Do not the savages of North America invoke the Great Spirit? Yes, gentlemen, all that is true, and I do not dispute it. But, mark, I have not affirmed that Monotheism is, in an absolute sense, the monopoly of Jews, Christians, and Mahometans. I said that it is only among them that this doctrine is found in a pure state, and as a doctrine generally taught. Elsewhere an attentive study discerns traces of Polytheism, of Dualism, or of Pantheism, underneath Monotheist affirmations; and so little is Monotheism a doctrine generally taught, that even those sages of India and of Greece who had seen or caught a glimpse of the unity of the principle of the world, took their place alongside of the people in the temples of idols. Outside of Christian influences, human reason is not dead, and reason sets towards unity; but whenever she has attempted to rise to the knowledge of its principle, she has found herself arrested as by a cloud. Assuredly the *man* Christ Jesus did not create Reason; but He has freed her from her chains, and has permitted her to take her heavenward flight. In the order of intelligence also, His word has been for the

world the word of liberty. He has been historically the great propagator of the doctrine of the unity of God, and to-day He is its great conserver.

I said in my first lecture that separation of thought from Christ often involves, in our day, the destruction of all religious faith, and I cited the example of Jouffroy. In this respect things have much changed during the last hundred years. In the eighteenth century, many minds that had been drawn away from the Christian faith sought refuge in Deism, that is to say, in the doctrine which acknowledges the existence of a God, Creator and Organizer of the universe, but of a God who, having established certain general laws, allows the world to go on, as it were, by itself, and which excludes, in a general sense, the idea of His intervention, and consequently of His manifestation in Jesus Christ. This doctrine is connected with many celebrated names. The Deism of Voltaire was so frivolous, so devoid of moral elements, that it could not be of much importance. To speak of Voltaire's philosophy is much; to speak of his religion were *too* much. That sparkling pen, that irony which no respect can check, the scoffs and sneers of that 'ape of genius,'[1] had great destructive power, but were incapable of founding anything serious.

The Deism of Rousseau is of another character. It is serious; it connects itself with the ideas of the moral

[1] Victor Hugo has written in *Les rayons et les ombres*—

'Voltaire reigned, that ape of genius,
Sent among men by commission of the devil.'

consciousness and of the judgment to come. And thus it has offered to so large a number of minds, separated from the Christian faith, a harbour of refuge, wherein they have been able to retain faith in God and the hope of immortality. This influence of the religion of Rousseau has been brought out by a historical event. In the worst days of the French Revolution, Atheism was rampant. In the streets of Paris, under the eyes of a people who, as M. Thiers says,[1] were greatly diverted by this new religion, they promenaded a woman representing the goddess Reason. What followed? A fact which M. Lamennais has expressed in the following strong language. After recalling the dark days of 'the Terror,' he adds: 'France, covered with debris, presented the appearance of a vast cemetery; when, lo! in the midst of these ruins, the very princes of disorder, seized with a sudden terror, retreat in alarm as if they had seen the spectre of nothingness. Feeling that an irresistible current is sweeping them towards the grave, their pride at once gives way. Overcome with fright, they hasten to proclaim the existence of the Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul; and, standing on the palpitating corpse of society, they cry aloud to the God who alone can bring it back to life again.'[2]

To put the same thing in a prose less eloquent, Robespierre, reacting against Atheistic tendencies, induced the Convention to issue this famous decree:

[1] *History of the French Revolution.*

[2] Essay on *L'indifférence en matière de religion*, vol. i. chap. x.

'The French nation acknowledges the existence of God and the immortality of the soul.'[1] The report referring to this decree, presented in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, contains a pompous eulogy of Rousseau, and the report itself is but an echo of the words to be found in *l'Emile* and in *le Contrat Social*. This event clearly shows the extent and the importance of the influence exercised by Rousseau over the religious thought of his contemporaries. The spiritual family of this famous writer has been a very numerous one; in our day there are but the debris thereof remaining. The present current of thought carries the minds of those that break with the gospel far from the haven constructed by the citizen of Geneva. What is opposed to the faith of Christians is no longer Deism; it is an Atheism, sometimes nude, sometimes covered with an almost transparent veil. Like a tree growing on the side of a precipice, to whose branches it was possible to cling, Deism seems to have been torn by a violent storm from the slope which leads into the abyss. Christian or Atheist! I do not say the alternative is inevitable; I do not accept it myself; but it expresses the most general disposition of minds in our day. The famous Proudhon accepted it. He wrote: 'Oh, Christianity is sublime! . . . If the Church succeeds in overthrowing the new thesis that I opposed to it (a revised edition of Atheism), I will abjure my philosophy and die in her arms.'[2]

[1] *De la justice dans la révolution et dans l'église*, vol. i. p. 164.
[2] *Ibid.*

In a public lecture delivered in 1864,[1] I pointed to the *renaissance* of Atheism, and founded my statement on a brief already considerable. Alas! this brief has been much enlarged since then. See what is taking place in the world of science and in that of letters. Numerous and brilliant attempts are being made to explain the creation while ignoring the Creator. The two chief centres of these negations are in England and in Germany, from whence they spread over France, Italy, the whole of Europe, and the United States of America. Some of the savants of whom I am speaking adore the goddess Reason; but most of them offer to us, under a modern badigeon, the ancient materialism of Democritus and Epicurus. These doctrines are not merely professed in public, which is the natural consequence of freedom of opinions; but in certain countries they are installed in the universities under government protection.

That is what is taking place on the summit of the intellectual hierarchy. Let us look at the working classes; what shall we see there? Atheism boldly lifting up its head. It has its newspapers; it figures on the programmes of constituted societies; it is professed in popular assemblies, and is often applauded by the audience. This is taking place in Germany, in Switzerland, in England, in Belgium, in the United States, in Italy. . . . I advance nothing of which I do not hold the proof in my hands. A marked contrast was noticed with respect to the religious dispositions

[1] *Le Père Céleste*, third discourse.

of the people of Paris between the Revolution of 1848 and the Commune of 1871. I have not at present to inquire into the causes which might be assigned for this change of opinion; I state a fact. In 1848, the insurgents showed themselves to be in some degree animated by pious dispositions; in 1871, Atheism was openly avowed.

Such is the state of things in the learned world and among the working classes. What may be observed in the middle classes? Can the production and organization of serious deistical manifestations be seen? No. When the middle classes depart from a positive Christian faith, they frequently come under the influence of Positivism, which says: Affirm nothing! Deny nothing! Do not occupy your mind with the things of another world! Conduct your affairs in this world as well as you can, and do not look beyond! This way of thinking (a real practical Atheism) responds too well to the mediocre inclinations of the human soul not to make numerous recruits. It easily insinuates itself into minds little cultured, when savants and members of Academies take the trouble to cover it with a gloss of science, and with an appearance of profundity. Mr. Disraeli, the present Premier of England, raised quite a cry of alarm a few years ago, saying that 'one might foresee in his country an invasion of Atheism so formidable that society would be overthrown.'[1] It is not my business to estimate the value of these fears, nor to defend the exaggeration

[1] In the preface to a new edition of his novels.

that they may contain; it will suffice me to establish the change that has taken place in the position of the religious question. In the eighteenth century, Atheism had relatively few adherents; Deism often reaped the heritage of the Christian faith. To-day this heritage passes on to Atheism; the mind which separates itself from Christ recognises and declares itself separated from God. This is not universal, but it is general. There are individuals who admit the existence of God, and stop there; but their doctrine has no power of propagation. Whether for its establishment or for its maintenance, the presence in the world of the idea of God, as a doctrine pure and general, is the work of Christ. This great idea has numerous consequences. I shall point out two, the one having reference to the scourge of war, the other to the development of science and industry.

Hobbes, a famous Englishman, affirms that men are all by nature at war one with another. This is an extreme theory; but the history of our past, and the information furnished by travellers as to the state of those nations that are strangers to our civilisation, give to it but too great a semblance of truth. In order to get rid of war, and of securing peace, there are two ways, connected with two names almost contemporary: Cæsar and Jesus Christ. Cæsar represents the establishing of peace by that force of arms which repress the passions; Jesus Christ represents the establishing of peace by that faith in God which renews the heart.

In order to appreciate the work of Jesus Christ in this relation, it is necessary to account, in a general way, for the mode in which religious ideas have intervened in the wars of the nations. Transport yourselves in thought to the plains of Troy. The Greeks and the Romans, the indomitable Achilles and the valorous Hector, are not alone on the field of battle. The gods take part in the conflicts of men; the breath of discord and the fury of the combats do not only rise from the heart of the warriors, but they descend also from the summits of Olympus. The real fact symbolized by these poetical conceptions is this: so long as it was admitted that there was a diversity of gods, and that every people had their own, national wars were fomented by religion. Ponder the effect, in such a state of things, of these words: 'One is your Father, which is in heaven; and all ye are brethren' (Matt. xxiii. 8, 9).

What is the natural consequence of these exalted ideas? The unity of the human family is proclaimed; the source of national wars is dried up. Religion, which was a principle of discord, becomes a principle of peace. Yes, peace is the consequence of faith in a common Father, which must check the evil instincts of the heart and fortify the good. How far has this work of pacification gone? Alas! the wounds of Germany and France are still bleeding; and here are hecatombs of men commencing once more in the east. At first sight, it seems as if this was the only progress we have made: by the use of

scientifically constructed weapons we succeed in killing a greater number of men in less time. This is a false appearance; we are at a great distance from the end to be attained, but we have walked in the path that leads thereunto. Next time you go by rail to Lausanne, look a little to the right towards Ouchy; you will notice a little conical eminence covered with trees. There, about the year 980 A.D., was proclaimed the *truce of God*. Do you know what the truce of God was? It was this: the Church interdicted combats during certain periods of the year, and each week from Wednesday evening to Monday morning. What a social state! War was incessant; they fought from town to town, from castle to castle, and it was with great difficulty that they cultivated the earth and reaped the fruits of the soil. Then, seeing that she was unable to obtain peace in those times of barbarism, the Church claimed, in the name of God, at least a weekly truce. We have made some progress since that time! War is still too frequent; but at the time of which I speak it was habitual. It was a chronic malady; it is now only an intermittent evil. Such is the teaching of history.

To the teaching of history may be added a contemporary fact well worthy of attention. Here are two armies before each other; the signal for battle is given. Who are those men, those women, distinguished by a red cross, the sign of their neutrality, who lavish their attentions impartially upon the wounded of the two hostile armies? Doubtless there have always been

good Samaritans who, under the influence of charity, have been ready to bind up the wounds of all, without inquiring as to their religion or country. But here there is something more. The ambulances were neutralized by an official convention entered into by the Powers, and signed at Geneva a few years since. This is something absolutely new. It is not a question of individual devotedness; it is the action of public powers, which show themselves to be penetrated by the idea of universal charity. Two spirits, therefore, manifest themselves: war—that is the ancient spirit, the spirit of evil; the impartial care of the wounded—that is the modern spirit, the spirit of Christ. What is without precedent in history, and what is a hopeful augury for the future, is the simultaneous official presence of the representatives of these two spirits on the battle-field. The contradiction is glaring, and becomes visibly so to all. Listen to these child-words, taken from a small volume of poems. They are French children, who speak in the dark days of foreign invasion. One of them is a fair-haired girl, unravelling lint, joyously looking upon the progress of her work; then suddenly she stops, and pensively exclaims: 'And yet how singular it is! Tell me, mother dear, why do men wound them since afterwards they bind up their wounds?' Another of these children, kneeling on her bed, with her curly locks hanging behind her head, lifts heavenward her bright blue eyes. 'Mother dear,' says she, 'when I say, Give us the victory! our little enemies offer up the

very same prayer. . . . For them and for us there must be then two good Gods.'[1]

This is no invented poetry; these are questions that have actually fallen from the lips of children. Well, what the children understand, will not nations and governments comprehend by and by? Yes, the new spirit will make progress. We justly hold for barbarous that tenth century, in which it was necessary to beseech men not to kill each other on at least four days of the week. Let us hope that historians will regard as barbarous this nineteenth century, which lavishes its gold and sheds rivers of blood in fratricidal wars. If the Convention of Geneva has neutralized ambulances, let us hope that, in a day which we may not perhaps see, another Convention of Geneva, . . . or of some other place, will so decide as that litigious nations shall have recourse to an arbitration different from that cursed one of fire and sword.

But no illusions, gentlemen! As long as evil passions shall menace society, a police force will be necessary; and it would require a dim-sighted optimism to admit that, in the present condition of mankind, those frightful collisions between nations will altogether disappear; but here is what may be legitimately hoped from a larger effusion of the Christian spirit. It may be hoped that the horrible accident of war will become more rare. It may be hoped that a better diplomacy will study more how to prevent war than how to

[1] 'Children's Questions' in *Les souvenirs d'une sœur*, poésies d'Henriette Hollard, Paris 1877.

utilize its results. It may be hoped that, every allowance made for natural sympathies, there will be formed a strong current of opinion that will pronounce itself not for France or for Germany, for Russians or for Turks, but above all for peace, for Christ, and for humanity. It may be hoped that war-budgets will not always swallow up the best part of the produce of the soil and of the toil of nations. Imagine a general convention of civilised peoples, which permits the reduction of standing armies to the necessities of social defence. What milliards would be economized! Reckon up all that could be done with those milliards for the welfare of mankind in utilizing all the resources which modern science places at the disposal of industry. This brings me to my second point, the influence of Monotheism upon science.

Modern science has its own marked characteristics, and dates from a fixed period; it was born in the dawn of the seventeenth century. 'Science,' says Herschell, 'received at that period an immense impulse. It might have been thought that the genius of man, long pent up, had broken away from its trammels. . . . Each one began to search out, and soon there dawned a new era, full of enthusiasm and of wonders, to which nothing else in the annals of mankind can be compared.'[1] Humboldt,[2] Liebig,[3] reproduce the thought of Herschell, and state it more precisely, in informing us

[1] *Discourses on the Study of Natural Philosophy*, Part ii. chap. iii.
[2] *Cosmos*, ii. pp. 364, 365.
[3] *Lord Bacon*, translated by Tchihatchef, pp. 3, 187, 217, 234.

that that epoch was the epoch of founders, and that whatever has since been produced is but the development of the fruitful germs then deposited in the soil of the human mind. What were the causes of this great movement of thought? There were many: the *renaissance* of letters and of arts in Italy; the discovery of America, which sent men in search of new truths, as it sent them in search of new countries; printing, which put the products of the mind into general circulation; then, and especially, the struggle against a defective method which, in some respects, fettered the labour of the human intellect. They had made of the Bible an encyclopædia of the sciences; a Roman tribunal condemned Galileo because he affirmed the motion of the earth. They had made of Aristotle an infallible teacher; the innovator Bruno had to quit Geneva because the Genevese had decreed, once and for ever, that neither in logic, nor in any other branch of learning, would any one among them be allowed to deviate from the opinions of Aristotle.[1] Two yokes, therefore, had to be broken in order to put the human mind into direct contact with Nature: the yoke of the Bible out of its domain, and the yoke of Aristotle. The struggle was long and sometimes violent, but at last science was set free, and it was understood that, in order to discover the true laws of the universe, it was necessary to study facts, and *not* the texts of the ancients. The ground thus cleared, what came to pass? Was science, as it is often said, simply the

[1] *Jordano Bruno*, by Christian Bartholmèss, vol. i. p. 63.

result of observation? No. Observation is the indispensable condition and the necessary check of all theories, because facts must be established before seeking the explanation of them, and that these explanations are valuable only as they are confirmed by experience. But explanations of facts are sought only under the influence of certain principles which direct the mind in its attempts. Now, the thought of the founders of modern science was essentially guided by two principles: that of the harmony of the world, and that of the simplicity of its laws. It was the idea of the simplicity of the laws of the world which, during a conflict that lasted 144 years, sustained the partisans of Copernicus against the attacks of his adversaries. It was the search for the simplicity of laws which inspired Newton (he says so in precise terms) when he discovered the great theory of universal gravitation. In our days, it was the idea of the simplicity of laws which led Fresnel (he says so in the most explicit way) to adopt that theory of luminous undulations which has transformed physics and made his name illustrious. All the founders and initiators up to our day have repeated the favourite maxim of Boerhaave: 'Simplicity is the sign of truth;' and all have searched carefully for the relation and the harmony of divers classes of phenomena. Whence come these principles? Simple laws, general laws, harmony of the elements of the world, is not all this natural to the reason? Yes. But if you do not consult history, you will never know how much difficulty reason has had to recognise its

own nature. In order to discover the principles which constitute it, reason, in fact, had to strive against the world of appearances, where everything is multiple and opposite. When you will have seen that, you will understand how much Polytheism came to the help of appearances against reason. When there was one god to guide the sun, another to lead the chorus of the stars, another to rule the motions of the sea, science was arrested in its source. The soil of Sicily trembles —it is the giant Enceladus who is shaking himself; Etna is in eruption—it is the giant Enceladus who is breathing, and who is vomiting from his vast mouth both smoke and fire. Certainly scientific genius was not wanting in Pythagoras, and shone with great brilliancy in Aristotle's works; but genius only brings forth all its fruits when it meets with a congenial soil. The Greek world, saturated with Polytheism, did not present to it that congenial soil, nor does modern Paganism.

I open the Almanack of Chinese festivals for the year 1850,[1] and I read: '5th day of the 8th moon (September 10), festival of Loui-Ching, the god of thunder.' There you have the study of electricity very much compromised. '27th day of the 10th moon (Nov. 30), festival of the gods of the five sacred mountains.' There you have the theory of elevations without a *raison d'être*. A recent traveller pays a visit to a volcano in the island of Havaï. He notices that

[1] This Almanack was published in Canton by M. Wells-Williams. See 'Modern China,' in *L'univers pittoresque*, p. 649.

his guides throw various objects into the crater, while crying, 'Aloha Pélé,' that is to say, 'I salute thee, Pélé.' Pélé is the goddess of subterranean fires.[1] There you have offerings which cut off the researches of our geologists.

In order to convert idolatrous nations to science, it is necessary to overthrow their idols; and there is only one way of doing this effectually, and that is, to erect on their ruins the temple of the unique and supremely wise Creator.

Such, from the standpoint of science, is the work of Christian preaching. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons in the second century of our era, developed the thought that, notwithstanding their number and their endless variety, all the objects in creation are found to be in sympathy and in harmony with one and the same whole.[2] This is no longer the secret thought of a few sages, who continued, nevertheless, to take part in the worship of idols; it is a public teaching, destined for all ages and for all classes of society; it is the faith of Israel shining forth on all the world. While feeding piety, that faith offers a firm basis to science.

What transpired in the Middle Ages after that the invasion of the barbarians had, for a moment, suspended the labour of the human intellect? Observation was almost null; method was profoundly defective. I have pointed out the error and the abuse; but look carefully; what do you find beneath the error and the

[1] *Quatorze ans aux îles Sandwich*, by C. de Varigny, p. 107.
[2] *Contra hæreses*, book ii. chap. xxiv.

abuse? The Bible diffuses the idea of the unity of God; the texts of Aristotle strengthen the logical culture of the mind. The questions discussed were often subtle, sometimes insoluble; but they furnished to the intellect a powerful gymnastic exercise. God is recognised as the unique Cause of all things; but one knows that this Omnipotent Creator has 'founded the earth by wisdom, and by understanding hath He established the heavens' (Prov. iii. 19). Men become habituated to unite the ideas of wisdom and of intelligence. In order to explain the world, it will be necessary, therefore, to seek the harmony and the simplicity of its laws. When the human mind, formed under such a discipline, shall bring itself freely to the study of nature, it will be armed with the principles necessary to its comprehension. That is what has come to pass. All the founders of science have reasoned thus: the world is harmonious, for there is but one God; the laws of the world are simple, for God is sovereignly wise. Thus reasoned Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, Galileo. Thus reason in our day three physicists who, more than any others, deserve the title of inventors or initiators: Fresnel, Ampère, and Faraday. They have all repeated, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty,' and this belief has fortified their reason. There are Atheistic savants, I know; there are but too many such; but they are not initiators. Up to the present (let us not involve the future), Providence has not permitted that any of the great secrets of nature be revealed to a man without

faith. The founders of our sciences have not been savants *though* believers, nor simply savants *and* believers. Their faith has directly acted on the direction of their researches; it has inspired their genius; it has been one of the causes of their discoveries. Our science is therefore Christian in its origin, not that there is a direct connection between Christian dogma in its totality and the systems of physics and of astronomy; but because Monotheism has fortified and directed the reason, and because it was by the preaching of the gospel that Monotheism was established in the world. There have often been conflicts between theology and science, or, to speak more correctly, between theologians and naturalists; but between faith in God and science there is a profound harmony. So thought Galileo, who justly opposed to the decrees of an erroneous theology which condemned him the consequences of his faith in an all-wise and omnipotent God. Now that the current of research is flowing steadily, a large number of savants follow it without knowing whence it took its rise; they drink the waters of a river whose source they ignore. Study, gentlemen, the imperfectly-known history of the origin of modern science, and when you think that you are the farthest from the object of our study, you will meet with an application, remote but real, of that word which Jesus spake of Himself: 'I am the Light of the world' (John viii. 12).

From science let us pass on to industry. The

universal Exhibitions inaugurated in our time have practical advantages for manufacturers and tradesmen; they also contain lessons for the men who meditate upon the destinies of mankind. I open the report of the French Commission on the Exhibition of 1851, and I there read: 'The Exhibition has demonstrated to the whole world what the manufacturers and the shippers of all countries knew, viz. that industry does not exist except in Christian lands.'[1]

That is the testimony (entirely disinterested as to the object of our study) of M. Bernoville, a manufacturer. In 1867 we have another Exhibition. I read in a political newspaper: 'The East exhibits more antiquities of value than modern products, proving that it possesses an active industry.'[2]

It is true that China produces an admirable lacquer; Japan, beautiful porcelain; Cashmere, shawls, etc. These are the products of a handicraft developed from generation to generation, and which has reached unto a degree of remarkable precision, perhaps from the very fact of the little intellectual movement of the people of the East. But the great industry, that which has produced the marvels of our machinery, that which, by the use of steam and of electricity, seems to defy time and space, is the monopoly of Christian nations. We carry it to India, where it has established itself under the protection of British bayonets; Japan seems to receive it with favour; but in China the ancient spirit is opposed to its progress, and it was announced

[1] Vol. iv. p. 128. [2] *Journal de Genève*, of 5th May 1867.

to us the other day that the first railway constructed in that vast empire was threatened with destruction by national prejudices.[1]

Industry, the great industry, is, then, the monopoly of Christian nations. The fact is incontestable, and the explanation of it is simple. Our power results from our knowledge. The forces of nature can only be utilized by obeying them; and in order to obey, we must know them. You jump into a railway carriage, and you pre-announce your arrival by a message despatched at the moment of your departure. These means of transport, of the body and of the mind, astonish men of my age who have witnessed their first appearance. But they do not astonish the new generations, so great is the influence of habit. Yet how much meditation, and how many vigils, were necessary to arrive at such results! If one wished to chronicle all the labours which have been necessary for the establishment of telegraphs and railways, one would require not merely a volume, but a whole library. Our industry, then, is the daughter of our science. What do we find at the foundations of our science? The principles of the harmony of the world, and of the simplicity of its laws, principles which have supported themselves upon the idea of a unique and wise God. Who has spread abroad in the world the knowledge of the unique God? Who has developed and fertilized the germs of reason? Who has thus done more for science and for industry than the sages of India,

[1] *Journal de Genève*, of 6th Nov. 1877.

of Greece, and of Rome? The Carpenter of Nazareth.

You enjoy all the facilities of modern civilisation. The improvement of machinery has so much reduced the cost of manufactured products, that there results an ease unknown to our ancestors. You can easily make a journey in a few hours that would formerly have lasted many weary days. Facilities in travelling enable you to meet frequently in the interests of business, of pleasure, of science, of humanity. It is easy for you, in a few hours, by an exchange of telegrams, to quiet anxious fear as to the fate of a parent, of a friend, of a child, who perhaps is at the other end of the world. If you are invited to give thanks to those savants who by their laborious and oft disinterested vigils have realized this surprising progress; if you are reminded that these men, though they handle not the pickaxe, the saw, or the trowel, compose one of the most laborious and useful classes of society, you will understand. If it is added, 'Give thanks to Jesus Christ!' you will now understand, unless, indeed, I have this evening wrought and spoken in vain.

It would be easy assuredly to caricature the ideas I have just expounded. If, on leaving this hall, you should say to a friend whom you meet in the street, 'We have just been told that it was Jesus Christ that invented machines, telegraphs, and railways,' you would provoke a smile. But if you were to say, 'We have just had pointed out to us the influence which the

doctrine of the only omnipotent and wise God had upon the movement of thought that produced modern science, and through science, industry,' the smile, if it appeared, would be, in my opinion, but the smile of ignorance or of determination (*parti-pris*).

THIRD LECTURE.

Christ the Comforter.

GENTLEMEN,—Truth is the object of reason, and I sought to show you in my last lecture what was the answer of Jesus Christ to the highest problem that could be stated by the human intellect. If truth be the object of reason, joy is the object of the heart. As plants turn towards the sun, as animals seek their food, so the human heart, under the empire of an irresistible instinct, seeks after joy, and finding it not, it suffers. The desire for happiness is indestructible; if it exists no longer in the form of hope, it manifests itself in the form of regret.

This is the fact that Pascal has expressed in the following words: 'All men are seeking to be happy. However different the means they employ, they all tend to this end. What makes some men go to war, and others to abstain from fighting, is precisely the same desire in both cases, but their points of view are different. The will never takes the least step but towards this object. This is the motive of all the actions of all men, even of those who go and hang themselves.'[1]

[1] Edition Faugère, vol. ii. p. 121.

Joy is the object of our desires, and it is easy to see that it is our destination. An infant cries without appreciable motive; you may be sure that there is some disorder in his health. Is he well? His good health will manifest itself by his smile of contentment or by his fits of mirth. Study yourselves in those moments, only too rare, when all is calm in your senses, in your mind, in your heart, when life flows down its course without an obstacle, and you will acknowledge, as the leper in the city of Aosta discovered in the intervals of his pain, that there is happiness in the bare facts of existing and of breathing. As soon as order exists, joy opens up like its flower; it is the sign of health of both body and soul; it is the mark of our destination.

Man goes forth, then, to the battle of life under the impulsion of the desire for happiness. What does he find? Merely what Béranger sang:

> 'Days made up of pain and pleasure,
> Of sunshine and of rain.'[1]

But for those who see in life nothing more than that existence which unfolds itself between the cradle that rocks a child and the cemetery where a corpse is hidden, what predominates is not sunshine, but mist, and rain, and sometimes storm. From this springs sadness, and sometimes despair. When the miserable are urged to suicide, they do not rid themselves of life as of a burden; but, disappointed in their deepest aspirations, they reject life as a lie. There exists, then,

[1] Béranger, *Mon habit.*

a bitter contrast between the destiny marked out for us by nature, and the destiny marked out by facts. We therefore need consolation. In writing at the bottom of one of his paintings these words, '*Le Christ consolateur*,' Ary Scheffer pointed to one of the most powerful works of Christ. Among the words spoken by the Son of Mary, few have re-echoed more deeply in the human heart than these: 'Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Matt. xi. 28). This power of consolation is so manifest that it has attracted the attention of some of those men whom Musset calls the antagonists of Christ. Here is what some German and French writers have imagined, in order to lessen the bearing of the fact. They have said (can they believe it?) that in Paganism all was peace and light, that antiquity was joyous and serene in the worship of its gods. They have affirmed that it is the Jews and the Christians that have inoculated sadness into the world, by painting life in sombre colours, and by substituting for the graceful images of Apollo and of Venus the horrible image of the Crucified. They have paraphrased some verses which very questionable literary theories had inspired in Boileau. Speaking of the gospel, of the *good news*, regardless of the meaning of the words he used, he said:

> 'To the mind, the gospel, on every side, offers nought
> But penances to be made, and merited torments.'[1]

Pagan humanity was then satisfied, and the Christian

[1] *Art poétique*, chant iii.

religion only comforts the sadness it has caused. I am not acquainted with an assertion more trifling on a subject so grave.

I will not speak of India; my thesis would be too easily proved. In the concert of human sorrows there is no more lugubrious note than that which rises from the banks of the Ganges and from the slopes of the Himalayas. Let us speak of joyous Greece. Paul of Tarsus wrote, 'The whole creation groaneth' (Rom. viii. 22). But who wrote this, 'To live in pain: such is the lot appointed by the gods to miserable mortals'? Homer,[1] of whom one may be permitted to affirm, with every good reason, that he had not read the letters of the Apostle Paul. The book of Job is not a merry book. In it we read, 'Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upwards' (chap. v. 7). But who wrote this, 'It were to be desired for the good of men that they had never been born, that their eyes had never beheld the brightness of the sun'? Theognis of Megara, a Greek poet of the sixth century B.C., who, according to every appearance, had not read the book of Job. Who wrote this, 'It is better to die than to live, for the heart has many sorrows'? Mimnermus, a Greek poet of the seventh century B.C., who does not appear to have perused the Old Testament. The book of Ecclesiastes casts upon life some sombre gleams: 'Vanity of vanities; all is vanity. What profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?' (chap. i. 2, 3). These are pro-

[1] *Il.* xxiv.

foundly melancholy words; but who wrote these others, not less melancholy, 'After the supreme happiness of not being born, and of avoiding the reefs of life, the happiest lot for whosoever has come into the world, would be to die at the very instant, and to escape from fortune as one flees from a conflagration'? These words are from Cicero,[1] who seems not to have read Ecclesiastes. Lastly, Herodotus informs us[2] that the Trauses, a Thracian tribe, were in the habit of seating themselves around the infant at its birth, and of groaning over the evils that it would have to endure through life.

The thesis that I combat is so strange that it is difficult to undertake it seriously. The Romans and the Greeks had joyous songs; they could dedicate to Venus and to Bacchus verses which our modern poets consecrate more simply to the celebration of love and wine. One fact will show better than many quotations what was their fundamental sentiment with respect to life.

Among the ancients, Greeks or Romans, the priest was an officer of public worship, who presided over certain ceremonies, but who had nothing to do with the moral life of the individual. What is called to-day the cure of souls, was altogether unknown to the priests of Paganism. But outside the priesthood there were men whose stated business was that of comforters. They offered their services to afflicted households. A signboard in the street pointed out the residence of

[1] Panckoucke's edition, vol. xxxvi. p. 467. [2] Book v. § 4.

these physicians of the soul, who, like the physicians of the body, sent in their bills to their patients. Consolatory literature was very abundant. Special manuals contained, under a certain number of rubrics, the discourses to be used for each category of sorrow. The need of consolation was then so deeply felt that it had become the basis of a lucrative industry.[1]

At the time when Christianity appeared the human race needed consolation. And later on? After affirming, in the words I have read to you, that all men desire to be happy, Pascal adds: 'Yet, after so many centuries, no one *without faith* has reached the mark at which all continually aim. All men complain—princes and subjects, noble and plebeian, the aged and the young, the strong and the feeble, the learned and the ignorant, the healthy and the sick; people of all countries, of all times, of all ages, and of all conditions.' These words, 'without faith,' arrested the attention of Voltaire, who, in his edition of the *Pensées* of Pascal, wrote the following note: 'I arrive in Paris from my country residence; I am introduced into a beautiful hall, where 1200 persons are listening to delicious music. When it is over the assembly divides itself into small groups, who go to partake of a good supper, and after supper they are not altogether dissatisfied with the evening. . . . In this city, everybody enjoy themselves, or hope so to do, or work to obtain joy. . . .

[1] Martha, *Les consolations de l'antiquité, dans les Seances et Travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques*, vol. C. pp. 331–358, and 645–661.

I say, then, to Pascal, "My great man, are you mad?"'

You understand. Mankind is not to be pitied because there are in Paris a number of persons who go to hear charming music, make excellent suppers, and afterwards enjoy the facilities which only a great city offers to the libertinage of rich men. The madness of Pascal consists in not recognising this. In writing these words, this great scoffer reminds me of another scoffer mightier than he. This Parisian, who is satisfied at the moment when France is full of misery, recalls the *Médecin malgré lui* of Molière. Snagarelle's wife is on the straw, and his children have no bread; but when Snagarelle has well eaten and drunk, he wants everybody else in his house to be drunk also.[1] This is gaiety; what is not gaiety is the response soon made by events to Pascal's annotator. A few years after he wrote his almost cynical note, in that very Paris where all were so contented with their lot because they had enjoyment or hoped to have it, the guillotine was permanently set up, and each morning long pages of the *Moniteur* appeared 'all red with human blood.' One could then see what miseries, what sufferings, what hatreds had festered beneath that corrupt world whose pleasures Voltaire celebrated. In the midst of a society shaken to its very foundations, crime, hideous and bloody, arose as the fearful avenger of the laws of morality, so outrageously violated by frivolous and brilliant vice.

[1] Act i. sc. 1.

Voltaire's note is, after all, but a mere freak, provoked by the want of attacking a religion which it was his misfortune to hate. This writer possessed an amount of good sense, which was manifest when his passions or his self-love were not in play. Let us hear him speak of the condition of men, when freed from that polemic intention which led him to contradict Pascal: 'This world, this stage of pride and error, is full of unfortunate beings, who speak of happiness. All things complain, all mourn while seeking comfort. None want to die; none would wish to be re-born. Sometimes, in our days, consecrated to sorrow, we wipe away our tears with the hand of pleasure. But pleasure fleeth away, and passeth as a shadow. Our griefs, our regrets, our losses are without number. The past for us is but a sad recollection; the present is fearful, if there be no future, if the night of the grave destroys the being who thinks.'[1]

There is Pascal's madness reproduced by the pen of his contradictor. And he speaks, not merely as Pascal, but also as Paul of Tarsus spake; he translates in good verse the apostle's thought: 'The whole creation groaneth.' Voltaire wrote in the last century. The world since then has made great progress. Public institutions have improved. We possess railways, telegraphs, chloroform. . . . Facilities for the transport of food prevent the terrible famines so frequent in the past; epidemics, terrible as they still are, are not so terrible as they once were, thanks to

[1] Poem on the Lisbon disaster.

the progress of hygiene. Reliefs have been multiplied; the causes of pain have decreased. I am far from undervaluing the progress made in our time in all these matters; but have we no more need of consolation? Is our generation more contented than those which have preceded it? I do not know. The human heart is so constituted, that its desires increase with the means of satisfying them. The growing equality in earthly conditions has multiplied envy, one of the bitterest feelings of the heart of man. A thrifty peasant in these days is better housed, better fed, better clothed than a well-to-do tradesman of a few centuries ago. He has greater facilities for the conveying of his person and of his goods. Is he more contented than his grandfather? I do not know. These comparisons are difficult to make; let us leave them. I ask you, on your conscience tell me, when you consider life between the two extremities of the cradle and of the grave, does it satisfy the desires of your heart? Are you a disciple of Fourier? I do not slight the portion of truth contained in the theory of association; but do you think that nothing more is required to convert our globe into a scene of unmixed happiness than to replace our towns and villages by *phalansteries?* If you believe it, you must be very young, young in years or in reflection. . . . I shall continue to speak for those among us who have another experience of life, and who, though perhaps the privileged of fortune, are often tempted to repeat the words of the patriarch Jacob, and say with him,

'Few and evil have the days of the years of my life been' (Gen. xlvii. 9).

There exists a universal complaint about the conditions of human existence. What are the sources of this complaint? We might mention three: pain, the insufficiency of joys, death.

Pain! The pains of the body are so obvious that it were superfluous to speak of them at any length. I will not draw, in a pathetic style, any harrowing paintings. I will not speak of the unhappy inmates of our hospitals, nor of those more fortunate persons who, in their own homes, can obtain advice from the physician, and remedies from the pharmacy. Without reckoning those whom we call invalids, sickness in various forms attacks the greater portion of all ages and conditions of mankind. There are certain states of the organs of the body which, without apparent injury, obstruct the play of the faculties, and quench the joys of life. How many poor wretches are there who, without experiencing violent pain, feel their spirit miserably bound in the chains of matter, and who could with reason cry, 'Who shall deliver me from this body?' (Rom. vii. 24). These are miseries all the more deserving of pity, inasmuch as they do not command public commiseration, and are deprived of the comforts which sympathy offers.

However great the number of the sick and of the ailing, there are persons in good health, even in this age of nervous affections; but how many of these sound and vigorous bodies there are which contain

souls entirely free from pain! How many shattered affections, and, what is still sadder, deceived! Look at the result of even the most legitimate ambition. Reckon the successes in commerce, in art, in letters, in industry. For *one* who succeeds, how many are there who complain of their bad fortune! Farmers are not the only men who sow without reaping, and who often see a sudden storm destroy the products of lengthened toil. Forget not hidden griefs; they are more cruel than those which show themselves. Consult the men who are admitted into the intimacy of families; they will tell you how many homes, apparently happy, are like those fruits, beautiful to look at, but which when opened reveal gnawing worms and decay.

Let us not consider merely one aspect of human affairs. There are sorrows in life, but there are joys also. Assuredly; but many of these joys are of this character. So long as a man hopes for what he has not, he says to himself, 'When I can get this or that, I shall be happy;' but possession deceives. At the moment when one reaches a desired end, joy is keen, but use takes the edge off pleasure, and gives birth to satiety, the mother of ennui. Take an example. How many men enslaved by toil say to themselves, 'When I shall have made a sufficient fortune, what joy I shall find in rest!' Doubtless rest is an enjoyment, when it is an interval between two acts of labour, a period in which the exhausted powers are recreated for future work; but there is no

kind of satisfaction which more than this brings on at length a dull and heavy sadness. In exceptional cases this fact may immediately occur. A Genevese merchant, now retired from this world, one day handed over his business to his old clerks. Next morning he awoke early. His thoughts were plunged into the future of his days. What should he henceforth do? Alarmed at the void which opened up before him, he lit his lantern (it was winter), and went to the office of his successors, with whom he engaged himself as a voluntary helper.

But are there no stable and increasing joys? Yes, gentlemen, there are such in pure affections, in the consciousness of an activity crowned with success, in the pleasures which art, literature, and science procure; but here comes in the third source of universal complaint—death. Death is the horrible consolation of the despairing. For happy worldlings, if they are but serious, and are without the hope of a resurrection, it is the destruction of all joy.

Each of us is inscribed in the civil state under the date of his birth. For each of us that date awaits another; a blank line is reserved for the registration of our decease. Have you ever reflected when looking at a clock? Do you sometimes follow the oscillations of the pendulum, and say to yourself: An unknown number of these oscillations will measure out the duration of earthly existence. A number for me, a number for each of those I love! Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse, learnt that one of his courtiers considered

him to be very happy. To bring him to a more correct appreciation of his happiness, he made Damocles (this was the courtier's name) sit down at a splendid and sumptuous banquet; but a sword suspended by a single thread was hung above the head of the guest. The sword of Damocles is the true and terrible image of that death which is always hanging over the head of every human being. When one thinks long about this, a dark cloud obscures the sun of our existence; for, to a foreseeing heart, that which must die is already dead. This prospect of the inevitable end of all earthly existence produces sometimes very remarkable effects; it may suffice to change the direction of a life. A man who, a few years since, finished his career on the borders of our lake,[1] has related, in words which I shall cite, the effect produced on his soul by the distinct prospect of death, and of the continuous dying which leads to it. He was pursuing his studies in Paris. He says: 'I was a student, seventeen years of age, and had just obtained many honours in my college, and was in transports of joy. Full of hope, free from all suffering and pain, enjoying my work, I was happy to live. And this was why one night, instead of going to sleep (I can still see that little cell-like dormitory), I was led to meditate upon my welfare. Now that reverie was, under the most simple and nearly trivial form, the greatest event of my life. Up to that time I had been but a child.

[1] Father Gratry, who died on the 7th Feb. 1872, at Montreux, Canton de Vaud.

One hour after that I was a man. I was recapitulating my recent successes, and contemplating greater things in the year in which I was then entering, and in that which was to follow. I thought I saw these last years pass away in labours vigorous and fruitful. I saw growing, little by little, the powers of my mind; I felt talent coming. . . . I was leaving college, and beginning — (always in my vision) — other studies preparatory to my supposed career. In those studies and in that career I was hoping to achieve the greatest success. . . . Fortune was coming by superaddition, solid, superabundant, honourable, the fruit of toil and of fame.

'Then there opened out a picture of great beauty. I could see a splendid mansion in the midst of a rich estate; my much-beloved father and mother living near me. Then the central light of the picture, the soul of the glory, of the estate, of the fortune, the ideal being dreamt about from the first hour of youth, appeared in the splendour of her beauty, in the supernatural power of the purest, the strongest, and the most religious love that ever was. . . . And life was advancing, always more beautiful and more filled as my years were unrolling and reckoning up. And, in fact, I was reckoning my years. I was going from youth to manhood, then from manhood to maturity, and these years of maturity were accumulating.

'Suddenly I perceived, with acute sadness, that at the age at which I was arriving my father's years were exceeding the ordinary limits of life. Then my father

was dying, and I was at his death-bed. My mother, my almost adored mother, was surviving up to the most advanced age. But at length she also died. Filled with grief, I was closing her eyes. My sister and my friends were one by one following in the common track, and leaving me. But, lo! in her turn, the noble and fair partner of my youth, the life of my soul, was entering into her winter, and was gathering up her rays, preparing to depart. Shall I survive her also? Yes; she also was dying. There she lay, cold and stiff, before my eyes. At last my hour was arriving, and I was on my death-bed. Yes, the moment will come when I shall be stretched on a bed, then I shall struggle with death, and I shall die. . . .

'Such is life! All men have been born and have died thus from the beginning, and will to the end of the world. Generation succeeds generation; they pass on rapidly, and disappear. And I saw, in a light and in forms which nothing will ever efface from my memory,—I saw the innumerable multitudes from the beginning to the end of the ages, passing—passing as flocks which go unconsciously to the slaughter. . . . At this sight I was motionless, as if I had been transfixed by astonishment and terror.'[1]

This terror was fruitful; it led Alphonse Gratry to seek and to find the consolations of the Christian faith. These consolations will presently form the subject of our study, but other subjects claim our attention for a few moments more.

[1] *Les Sources*, 2d part, pp. 14–22.

In the presence of trouble, one may make an effort to forget it. You know the saying so often realized, and in so deplorable a manner, 'He drowned his cares in wine.' The abuse of alcohol in our countries, the use of opium among the Chinese, are partly the result of a sensual attraction, but they are also largely the result of sufferings of which men wish to lose the sense in the stupor of intoxication. Trouble deprived of true consolations enters to a large extent into the genesis of vice. A similar phenomenon is manifest among those who, without falling into degrading excesses, yield themselves up without restraint to the dissipation of pleasure. Let us leave these painful subjects, and let us look at the consolations offered by the sages of antiquity, by the philosophers in whose writings the professional comforters of whom I have spoken sought their recipes.

Three centuries before the Christian era, there lived at Athens a man of gentle disposition, generally beloved, who, in a garden beneath the lovely sky of Greece, talked peacefully with his friends. This man, now celebrated, was called Epicurus. A materialistic philosopher, he had fixed his attention on the joys which have their origin in the human body. He had observed that the functions of the organs offer enjoyments always within the reach of all; but that, through our own fault, we habitually lose those enjoyments, because every excess involves evils worse than the pleasure they produce. He therefore prescribed moderation to his disciples, and even abstinence in a certain measure. The fact

is that he recommended an excellent hygiene. Debauchees, libertines, and even all men, might learn valuable lessons in his school; but the groundwork of his doctrine is hideous. His aim is to place man in a state of quietude, where he may relish in peace the joys of physical life. At what price does he promise this happiness? 'In order to escape the greatest possible number of pains and cares, we must keep clear of almost all that interests man. A father has joys that he who is not a father has not; but what torments also! The pleasures of paternity are not worth what they cost. An ambitious man has doubtless great pleasures; but what disquietudes and disappointments! It is infinitely better for a man to confine himself to a medium condition, and to hide himself in his obscure felicity. . . . Let us be content to live simply like the beasts, without care about another life or about to-morrow.'[1]

But how about sickness? 'There are certain enjoyments proper to that state. But what if pain should become violent and life unbearable? The wise man does not then hesitate to put himself to death.'[2] But after death? 'After death there is nothing; the terrors of a judgment to come are superstitions from which science delivers us. Nothing exists but matter, and when the atoms which form a human body are disaggregated, there remains nothing of the man. To

[1] Denis, *Histoire des théories et des idées morales dans l'antiquité*, vol. i. pp. 292, 293.

[2] See Denis, vol. i. p. 287.

sum up, the wise man culls the flowers of life, and if he is too much torn by the thorns, he kills himself.' Such is the wisdom of Epicurus.

At the same epoch, and in the same city, in Athens, the luminous centre of ancient wisdom, lived another man of austere mien, Zeno, the chief of the Stoics. He observed that 'physical joys are not always at our disposal. Man is not master of his own body, but, thought he, man is master of his soul. Then, again, the pleasures of sense are animal pleasures. To place one's joy in the sense of one's power, in the victory that one gains over one's inclinations, this is safer and better. One must therefore rise above sensuality and vanity, above all the desires which trouble ordinary souls, and find one's happiness in one's self, and in those things which depend solely upon one's self. Thus the wise man will be shielded from the blows of fortune, and will find peace in his own power, and happiness in the sense of his dignity.' Such is the morality of the Stoics. It promises happiness, but at what price? Let us consult, in this matter, two men placed at the opposite extremities of the social scale—the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus the slave. Trained in the same school, they held the same tenets. Let us open the little manual of Epictetus: 'Consider what in itself is all that serves or amuses thee, all that thou likest. . . . Is it a vase that pleases thee? It is fragile: if it should be broken, do not trouble thyself. Is it thy son, thy wife, a friend that thou cherishest? Nature made them mortal: if they

die, be not thou disconsolate. Dost thou hear a raven croaking out an evil augury? Let this not disturb thee. Reflect an instant, and say, This sinister cry cannot forebode any evil unto me; it can only menace my body, my goods, my reputation, my wife, or my children.' In this passage the feelings of the heart are most fearfully implicated; but here is another quotation, in which a deeper wound is made to the human conscience: 'If thou wouldst advance in the way of wisdom, drive far from thee this thought: If I do not chastise my slave, he will be wicked. It is better that thy slave should be wicked than that thou shouldst be unhappy.'[1]

To detach one's self from everything in order to enjoy one's power and dignity; such is the doctrine. But what if happiness is still wanting? 'Does life displease you? You are free to leave it.'[2] Such is the maxim, and Seneca has devoted an entire letter to the explanation of the different ways of committing suicide. These facts inspired Pascal with the following forcible remark. He says: 'The supreme good,—*Ut sis contentus temetipso et ex te nascentibus bonis* (So that thou must be content with thyself and with the good things that come to thee). There is a contradiction here, for they recommend suicide. What a happy life that must be from which one delivers himself as from a plague!'[3]

The two doctrines of which I have just spoken

[1] See the little manual of Epictetus, Articles 8, 16, and 24.
[2] Seneca, Letter 70. [3] *Pensées*, Edition Faugère, vol. ii. p. 96.

must not be put upon the same level. Zeno is as much higher than Epicurus as the soul is higher than the body. He does not explain the universe by a concourse of atoms, but by the unfolding of a universal Reason, with which the wise man associates his thoughts. Having entered upon this course, he inspired his disciples with noble and lofty sayings. At the end of the Roman Republic, while effeminate souls helped to swell the flock of Epicurus, those high-spirited souls who, amid the universal debasement, were wrapped up in the consciousness of their dignity, sought support in the philosophy of Zeno. But with respect to that doctrine of happiness which forms the special object of our study, the two doctrines arrive at the same result. Both of them demand the suicide of the heart. They place happiness in selfishness,—the egotism of the senses or the egotism of the mind,—and when, conquered by evidence, they find themselves in presence of the ills of life, they have nothing to offer the miserable save the consolation of death.

Antiquity has known better thoughts. Pythagoras, Plato, proscribed suicide on the ground that man has been placed in life like a soldier at a post, which he may not abandon without orders from his chief. But these doctrines, the best in antiquity, had been enfeebled rather than developed at the epoch of the Roman Empire. When Paul arrived at Athens,[1] it was the Epicureans and the Stoics that he found in the public place, and history informs us that at that time

[1] Acts xvii.

these two sects divided between them the greatest number of minds.

Who was Paul? A man that had suffered many wrongs. He had been insulted; he had suffered from hunger and thirst; he had been beaten with rods and cast into prison; he had encountered many disappointments in the work that he had undertaken; causes of affliction had not been found wanting by him; but he had been comforted, and he would comfort others (2 Cor. i. 4, xi. 23–29). What consolations did he offer the Athenians in exchange for those of the Epicureans and the Stoics? The consolations of Christ, which are now to occupy our attention.

We have seen that the doctrine of a God unique and sovereignly wise, by fortifying the natural tendencies of the human mind, became the basis of modern science; that is the special share of reason in the work of Christ. The share of the heart is summed up in the idea of the goodness of the principle of the universe, in the formula, 'God is love' (1 John iv. 8). God is not merely the Eternal, the Creator, He is the Father. The idea of the goodness of God is doubtless present, and often shines with great refulgence in the books of the Old Testament; but it is not there found with those general and pre-eminent characteristics which Christ has given to it. It was by throwing a vivid light upon the doctrine of Divine Love that Jesus completed Jewish Monotheism, at the same time that He made it pass the narrow limits of the land of Israel and overspread the world.

The aim of the Being of Love in creation is the happiness of his creatures. Notice that this doctrine corresponds exactly to the fundamental and indestructible instinct which leads us to desire joy. This instinct in the human soul is the mark of the intention of the Creator. Our desire does not deceive us. It may not be fully realized in this present life, in a world where the order willed by God is profoundly disturbed; but the present is not the final life; it is but a prelude, a time of preparation and of necessary trials. What we call death is only a transition, a crisis in our existence. For the consolations of nonenity, which are the last refuge of the wisdom of Epicurus and of Zeno, Paul substitutes the consolations of life, of eternal life.

Does it result from this that the disciple of Christ, satisfied with the heavenly future which he expects, will concern himself no more about the evils of the present life, that he will remain impassive, though from other motives, like the Stoic shut up in his pride? This has sometimes been asserted; religion has been reproached of drying up, by its hope of heaven, the springs of earthly progress, and of inspiring in devoted souls the humour of Lafontaine's rat: 'The things below I now regard no more!'[1]

Is it necessary to say to what degree such an interpretation of Christian doctrine, whether it comes from its friends or from its foes, is a monstrous error? The essential duty of every disciple of Christ is to labour

[1] *Le rat qui s'est retiré du monde*, book vii. fable 3.

for the alleviation of all suffering, for the relief of all distress. He knows it; but he also knows that, in the conditions of the present life, there will always be the poor, the poor in the widest sense of the word—the poor of happiness. The work of Jesus Christ with respect to human misery is twofold: to diminish, as far as possible, evils of every kind; to offer consolations under those ills which will always exist. All these consolations gather round the thought of Eternal Love, which forms their common centre. They concern suffering, the insufficiency of joys, death. Let us begin with the second.

Why are the joys of earth insufficient? Because we ask from them what they cannot give? They are incapable of filling the void of our heart, because nothing temporal and transitory can satisfy desires which tend towards infinity, desires which are the pledge and the presentiment of loftier destinies. But suppose a faith strong enough to make the things to come present, and things invisible to the bodily eye visible to the eye of the soul. See, unfolding beyond death, the true life accomplished; what will the result of this be? Distaste for the joys of this life? No, sirs, save in the case of a morbid disposition. On the contrary, the joys of earth, faded and withered, objects of disgust for whoever has asked from them all his happiness, revive and bloom, when they are only asked for what they can supply. The glory of heaven does not bedim, it brightens them. Let me illustrate this by a comparison. Here is a young

man far from his native land. He finds himself in one of the most beautiful places in the world; he finds himself, for example,

> 'On the happy shore,
> Where Naples mirrors in an azure sea
> Her palaces, her hills, her cloudless stars,
> Where the orange tree blooms beneath a sky for ever clear.'[1]

But he is home-sick. Vesuvius has for him no beauty, the blue sea is without charm; the orange trees wave to the whisper of the zephyr, but do not bring any sweet emotion to his heart; nostalgia fixes a sombre veil between nature and his soul. He receives permission to depart; the veil is raised! The joy of returning home irradiates the country where he is but a stranger. He feels anew the beauties of an earth which had been for him, but a short time since, a place of exile. So is it with our life. A place of exile and of sorrow for those who ask from it complete happiness; a sojourn, full of tokens of the goodness of the Creator, for whoever sees beyond the veil of death the everlasting home.

With respect to suffering, the work of Christ has two stages. He makes us accept it—that is the lower stage. He makes us welcome it—that is the higher stage of spiritual development. The acceptance of suffering is an element common to all piety. The doctrine of Mahomet bears the name of *Islâm*, and islâm is a word which signifies submission,

[1] '*Tristesse*,' *dans les Méditations poétiques de Lamartine.*

resignation; but Christianity here brings in a special element, the example of its Founder. Speaking one day to His disciples of the persecutions which awaited them, Jesus alluded to those which awaited Him, and said unto them, 'The disciple is not above his Master. . . . It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master' (Matt. x. 24, 25). How many troubles have been borne in peace through the thought of the agony of Gethsemane and the torture of Golgotha! A charitable lady of Geneva, bending over a sick-bed, spoke one day to a poor Savoyard woman who was afflicted with acute pains. She expressed to the invalid her warm sympathy, her deep compassion. The invalid replied, in her own peculiar language, 'Oh, ma'am, but our Lord suffered more than this.' That thought soothed and consoled her. In the union of the servant and his Master in suffering, there is something more than the resignation of Islâm.

To make us accept suffering is the first stage in the work of Christ; the second is, as I have said, to make us welcome it. To welcome suffering! This is not natural, and yet it is real. And do not accuse me in speaking thus of contradicting what I have said as to the universal and indestructible desire of happiness. Sufferings of a lower order may be mastered by higher gratifications. One may see in a tortured visage a look of heavenly joy; and in the anguish of the heart the soul may rejoice in the approval of conscience. Even sorrow may thus become the cause of joy.

Have you suffered ever so little for a just cause? Have you for this lost some of your goods, sustained some injuries? If so, have you not learnt that one may experience at the same time two contrary emotions, of which the one not only masters but transforms the other? Know you not that one may be happy while suffering for a good cause? Experience alone, enlightened by reflection, may make us welcome suffering by bringing us to acknowledge that it is often useful. Suffering tempers character, it makes men of us. Even for the life of the body, as a French physician reminds us, 'pain has a salutary function.'[1] All the elements of an apology for pain are condensed, fortified, and completed in the Christian doctrine. The Christian succeeds in welcoming chastisement, as the invalid welcomes a painful but salutary remedy. He knows that suffering is meted out to him by a Father who only wills his welfare; and here, once more, the example of Christ comes to the assistance of His teaching. Not only do men deem it just that the disciple should be treated as his Master; it is one of the great laws of the spiritual order, that men desire to resemble those whom they admire and love. How many faithful servants have desired to suffer with their masters! How many children have begged as a favour to share the captivity of their parents! Well, men have been found sometimes who have welcomed suffering because Christ suffered; outrages, because He was outraged; death,

[1] Dr. Richet, in the *Revue philosophique*, of Nov. 1877, p. 481.

because He died for them.[1] This brings me to my third point, Christ the consoler of death.

Your thought has anticipated my speech. It was He that 'brought life and immortality to light' (2 Tim. i. 10). With what firm and simple assurance He speaks of the future! One day He alludes to His approaching end. What says He to His disconsolate disciples? 'Let not your heart be troubled. In my Father's house are many mansions. Where I am, there ye shall be also' (John xiv. 1–3). Death is but a transition, a momentary separation, which is the prelude to an eternal reunion. Travellers who climb the Alps on an autumn day are often enveloped in a damp cold mist, which hangs about the ground; but if they raise their eyes, they now and then catch glimpses of the sunlit summits overhead. So the glance of the Christian pierces through death, and through the shadows of the sepulchre he sees the radiant heights above the eternal azure.

To the pain of death, the gospel opposes a fact as well as a doctrine—the resurrection of Christ. Paul writes to the Thessalonians: 'I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if ye believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Him will God bring with Him. Wherefore comfort one another with these words' (1 Thess. iv. 13–18). Here I must open out a parenthesis. It might be said, and perhaps some

[1] See, for example, the *Vie de Lacordaire*, by Father Chocarne.

of you are saying it now within yourselves, 'There are savants who dispute the reality of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. They compare texts; they discuss passages; they raise objections. The science of criticism is therefore necessary here. Before affirming the resurrection, you must reply to those who deny it. You are going beyond your programme.' I do not intend, gentlemen, to go beyond my programme. There are scholars, I am well aware, who do not admit that Christ left the tomb; but these scholars do not deny that they have a problem to solve: they must explain how the disciples came to believe in the resurrection of their Master; for the fact of this belief is beyond all doubt. The resurrection is contested, the announcement of the resurrection is incontestable. That is the first fact which ought to be the basis of a serious research. Now the solution of the problem, as I have said, is out of the reach of textual criticism, because this criticism is inevitably dominated by a principle of faith, or by a principle of negation.[1]

The apostles believed in the resurrection of their Master, and this belief was one of the forces of their ministry. On this point all Christendom shares in the faith of the apostles. In our day the representatives of the various Christian Churches, who met one Easter Sunday in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, bore witness, by the fact of their meeting, to the faith which united them, at the same time that they bore witness, alas! by their unhappy quarrels,

[1] See First Lecture.

to the divisions which separated them.[1] After considering all the difficulties to which the accounts of the resurrection may give rise, one must, if he be sincere, come to the conclusion reached by a learned living theologian, M. Reuss of Strasbourg: 'There remains this incontestable fact, that the Church which has lasted eighteen centuries was built on this foundation.'[2]

These are the facts upon which my study is based. If there exists a single historical verity; if it is certain that Cæsar crossed the Rubicon, and that Bonaparte died at St. Helena, it is certain that the message 'Christ is risen' has been proclaimed by Christendom, from the day when Peter the boatman harangued the crowds in Jerusalem to our times, when this message is sent back by all the echoes of the globe. That is a fact. Men may seek to explain it in various ways; but who can contradict it with seriousness and sincerity? No one. And who can deny that the message of the resurrection is one that has consoled many hearts, and raised heavenward many eyes sadly cast downward towards the earth? Assuredly no one.

The hope of immortality is not the monopoly of the Christian faith. The Indian disciple of the Vedas and the Buddhist hope for a happy transmigration. Socrates conversed with his friends about the prospects of the future. When Cato would put an end to his existence, in order that he might not survive the

[1] Félix Bovet, *Voyage en Terre Sainte*, p. 245.
[2] '*La Bible*,' *Synopse des trois premiers Evangiles.*

liberties of Rome, he sought the hope of a future life in one of the dialogues of Plato. The belief in the existence of the soul after death is so thoroughly conformed to the heart and to the reason, that it is one of the elements of universal religion. But this doctrine is often impaired, and sometimes grossly distorted. Among the Greeks and the Romans, the hope of immortality diminished rather than increased after the time of the great disciples of Socrates.[1] In our days, belief in a future life shares the fate of faith in God; it generally disappears from those minds which separate themselves from Jesus of Nazareth and from His influence. It seems as if all the hopes of mankind have entered, like rays of light, in the aureola of Christ, and are extinguished when He retires.

God forbid that I should ever disparage the efforts of ancient or modern wisdom striving to collect the gleams of hope which issue from the heart and the reason of man; but I disparage nothing in affirming that Christ is the great consolator of death. Enter a house of mourning. If all faith is therein extinct, you will find either indifference, or despair, or a sullen resignation; then, the work of time, distraction and oblivion. Cross the threshold of a Christian family which also mourns its dead. *There* pangs of sorrow may be poignant, bitter; but there will be a smile beneath their tears, for this is a grief consoled that is transformed in hope. See what takes place at the

[1] See *La vie eternelle*, by Naville, 3d Lecture: 'The Thoughts of Mankind.'

cemetery. They are burying a mere citizen of earth. You will hear his eulogy. Alas ! if he be a politician, you will find perhaps that they take advantage of the dead to rouse the passions of the living. Not a single thought about the future, not a single gleam of heaven falls upon that grave ! Such a scene as that always seemed to me as cold as the tombstone, doleful as the rattling of the earth upon a coffin. But here are some believers confiding to the earth the remains of their beloved. They weep, but they can raise to heaven the hymn of hope, 'Not lost, but gone before.'

Truly Christ has triumphed over death. For those that place their trust in Him, the tomb is but the shell in which the chrysalis will put forth the wings by which it will ascend to heaven. How glorious are the promises of Christ ! There is fulness of joy in the prospect of an abode where all the noble instincts of our hearts will be gratified, where there shall be no more tears, no more mourning, no more separations, because death shall be no more. But this abode of peace and joy is also the abode of holiness. Are we worthy of it ? For him who seriously listens to the voice of conscience, for him who believes in justice, it is impossible not to feel the poignant bitterness of these words, 'The sting of death is sin' (1 Cor. xv. 56). Who shall deliver us from this bitterness ? The answer to this question will form the subject of my next lecture.

FOURTH LECTURE.

Christ the Redeemer.

GENTLEMEN,—Out of the contrast existing between the instincts of the human heart which seeks for joy, and the sufferings which abound in life, comes forth the need of consolation. Moral culture produces feelings of a different nature. The dictates of the conscience convey to the mind the idea of that which is good, and man feels himself obliged to realize it. This feeling is not so general as that which formed the subject of our preceding study. To desire happiness, it suffices to live; to desire that which is good, necessitates the culture of the conscience. There is, perhaps, no human creature whose conscience is absolutely annihilated, no soul in which there remains not at least the 'smoking flax.' Nevertheless, the history of humanity and that of our own heart teach us, that if the conscience is not altogether dead, it is, at least in many cases, weakened, obscured, dying. Does it live? Is it faithfully listened to? Is it illumined by the true light? We then succeed in understanding that the Creator has wrought out a plan for the happiness of human souls; that each one

has his place marked out in the great work, and must labour to do his part towards effecting the common good.

He who has attained unto these high ideas, feels how far he is from being what he should be; he has a distinct consciousness of his imperfection. Is this all? No! The moral phenomenon does not limit itself to this sense of imperfection. Take the case of an artist (a poet, painter, or musician). If he possesses the genius of his art, and is not blinded by a stupid pride, he admits that his productions are far from the ideal which he has pursued. If he has done his very best, he may regret his inability, but does not reproach himself because of his imperfection. In the moral order, things are quite different. Brought face to face with the conscience, which has revealed the plan of God, man does not merely feel himself imperfect, he feels himself *guilty*. Thus is formed the sense of moral evil, or, to call it by its proper name, the consciousness of sin. Pascal says: 'The essence of sin consists in the possession of a will opposed to the revealed will of God.'[1] The need of consolation springs from suffering; the need of forgiveness arises out of the consciousness of sin, and that is the commencement of the Christian life. Jesus Christ did not proclaim Himself to the world as coming to help imperfect beings to fulfil their destiny; He announced that He was the Saviour of the lost. When the people came to Him to be healed of their bodily ailments,

[1] *Pensées*, Faugère's edit., vol. i. p. 44.

He availed Himself of that opportunity to call off their thoughts from the wants of the body to those of the soul, and to promise the sick a pardon, of which He said He was the medium.

The ideas of sin and of pardon are not the monopoly of Christian doctrine. I open the Chinese Almanack of which I have already spoken, and read, opposite the 30th day of the 5th moon (5th Sept.), about a religious festival, the special purpose of which is to obtain the remission of sins. I consult the Vedas, and in that volume of old Indian prayers, I read: 'O Varunna, I invoke thee, desirous of knowing my sins. . . . Wise men have all told me the same thing, "Varunna is angry with thee." O Varunna, grant us absolution for the sins of our fathers, and for the sins which we ourselves have committed!'[1]

The consciousness of sin and of the need of an atonement is one of the originating causes of those sacrifices of which we shall soon have to speak. *There* is to be found one of the elements of universal religion. But that which characterizes Christianity is the fact of its having emphasized ideas like these, and made them the essential basis of religion. Open the prayer-books of the heathen (the number of those documents brought to light by modern knowledge increases yearly). You will discover that the petitions relate to temporal prosperity, to victory over enemies, to the fecundity of the earth, to the success of enterprises; while all the Christian may ask for the

[1] Max Müller, *La science de la religion*, p. 150.

present life is 'daily bread'; and what besides? 'Forgive us our trespasses; deliver us from evil!' Those are the essentials of Christian prayer, as taught by the Master Himself. It is the appeal of the guilty soul begging for pardon and for help. As long as the conscience is unawakened, as long as the consciousness of moral misery is wanting, it may be possible to hear a portion of Jesus' teaching, but the gospel, in the proper sense of the term, remains a sealed letter.

From this fact we may draw an important remark relating to education. The education of whom? Of all the world; of youth and of mature age, of others and of ourselves. We must remember that the law, as the Apostle Paul saith, is the 'schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ' (Gal. iii. 24). That which it behoves us to imprint upon the soul of children, and to cultivate continually in the soul of adults, is the consciousness of the holiness of that law. If it be forgotten, there exists the possibility of arriving at fatal consequences. Take this example: I was but a very young man, still a student, when asked to visit an aged man dangerously ill. I spoke a few serious words to him. 'Sir,' he replied, 'we are all great sinners. As to oaths, well, you know . . .; but as to a wicked action, I have never committed one.' This man had been taught according to orthodox doctrine. The avowal of a few oaths was the nearly derisive homage which he accorded his catechism; the affirmation that he had never been guilty of a wicked action was the serious homage with which he gratified

his pride. I then learned, and I have never forgotten, what may be the value of pious formulas learned by heart, and repeated from memory, when the conscience has not been called into exercise.

When the soul is seriously awakened to a sense of its sin, Jesus brings it pardon. This work of forgiveness is, by Himself, connected especially with His death. On a certain day, when addressing some Greeks who had drawn near unto Him, He announced His approaching end. For a moment that prospect troubled Him, but He said, 'For this cause came I unto this hour.' Foreseeing the death of the cross, He then said, 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me' (John xii. 27–33). In this manner He has pointed to His death as to the most important event of His life, and the most powerful means of His action upon the world. He has indicated this not only in words, but also by an action. When a man feels himself nearing his end, if he preserves his lucidity of mind, his last recommendations express either the dominant idea of his life, or that which he considers in that solemn moment as the most important. Now, we have in the life of Jesus Christ an act like this. Knowing that He was taking his last repast with His disciples, 'He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is My body which is given for you'; afterwards He took the cup, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you' (Luke xxii. 19, 20). In this manner was

instituted the Lord's Supper, which is in the larger Christian Churches the habitual centre of worship, and in all Churches the most solemn act of worship. Hence it follows that by an effect of a precise will of Jesus, expressed in the most touching manner, the dominant idea which must be connected with His work as the Saviour is the idea of His voluntary death for the salvation of men. This is a fact which results with certainty from the writings of the New Testament, consulted merely as historical documents.

The apostles, in their preaching, act conformably with their Master's instructions. Peter writes: 'Ye were . . . redeemed . . . with the precious blood of Christ, . . . who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree' (1 Pet. i. 18, 19, ii. 24). John writes: 'He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world' (1 John ii. 2). The anonymous author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes: 'Once . . . hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself' (Heb. ix. 26). When Paul preaches to the heathen of Athens, he teaches the existence of a unique Creator as the basis of all true religion; but when he writes to Christians, with the intention of reminding them of what characterizes Christianity, what does he say? Before everything else, he says, 'Christ died for our sins' (1 Cor. xv. 3). And, 'For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified' (1 Cor. ii. 2). The whole life of Christ is a work of salvation; but the attention of

His disciples was especially directed upon His death, considered as an expiatory sacrifice, the result of which was the redemption of the world.

Redemption means ransom. When Europeans were the slaves of barbarians, devoted men consecrated themselves to the work of their redemption, and to this end they instituted the Order of Redemption. Jesus Christ, by His life and by His death, ransomed men from the slavery of sin; He has paid the ransom of insolvent debtors. Hence the Church has given Him the title of Redeemer, though this title is never given Him, if I mistake not, in the writings of the New Testament. This work of redemption has been called by Jesus a work of God. It is God His Father who has sent Him, that through Him the world might be saved. It is God Who 'so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son' (John iii. 16, 17). Paul gives expression to this idea in the following words: 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them' (2 Cor. v. 19). And, 'It pleased the Father . . .; and, having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself' (Col. i. 20). Such is the formula of apostolical teaching.

How are we to understand these things? What is the manner of this atonement? What the nature of the bond which unites the Heavenly Father to the Son by Whom this redemptive work is accomplished? How are the life and death of the Son of Mary the manifestation of Eternal Love? It is impossible to approach

these questions without entering into the very quick of theological teaching on the Trinity and the Incarnation. I could not do this without departing from my programme. Before all research in special dogmatics, we must resolve the problem: *What ought we to think of Christ?* The only aim of our study is to gather proofs for the solution of this problem. In collecting these, I point out a fact: the Christian Church has been founded on the preaching of a Divine work for the redemption of the world. In order to seek the *how* of this work, it is necessary to admit its reality; to proceed otherwise would constitute a vice of method. I have pointed out a first fact: the nature of Christian preaching. I am going to point out a second: the influence of that preaching.

That influence has exercised itself in a manner little thought of by the action of Christian preaching for the abolition of human sacrifices. The custom of human sacrifices has, perhaps, been universal; at all events, it has been very general. Historians affirm this, and subterranean explorations, from which we seek so much information concerning epochs prior to history, bring to light human bones, which seem to be the remains of sacrifices.[1]

Is this horrible custom the monopoly of the most remote times of primitive epochs? Not at all. In 1836 the English discovered that in one of the provinces of India, certain people, called Khonds,

[1] Joly, '*L'anthropophagie et les sacrifices humains*,' *Revue Scientifique* of 8th Sept. 1877.

offered a great many human sacrifices. The victims were offered to Bera, goddess of the earth, in order to obtain the fertility of the soil. These victims were obtained by war, by robbery, or by purchase; and when the prisoners, the robbed, or the bought were wanting, the children of natives were sacrificed. On particularly solemn festival days, several villages would meet for the ceremony, and as many as two hundred human beings were sacrificed in one day. The English authorities were horror-stricken at this discovery, and with great activity wrought to reform the morals of this people. The administration accepted the aid of French missionaries in this work. M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire, who has related these facts in the *Journal des Savants*,[1] remarks that the union of French Catholic priests and Protestant English officers in a good cause is a rare and noble example. We are all, I hope, of his opinion. We all long for the day when the members of different Christian communities will unite together more than they do now to work, in the spirit of their common Head, in the holy cause of humanity. Happy the day when Churches will make a truce to all their contests of words, of writings, which only work evil, and emulate each other's zeal in the exercise of good, and employ, in the inevitable struggles to which they shall be called, no other arms than those of persuasion and devotedness!

When the English asked the chiefs of the Khonds to abolish their horrible custom, they replied, 'We

[1] July and August 1874: Campbell and Macpherson.

have always sacrificed human beings; our fathers have handed us down this custom, which we have observed, never thinking that we did wrong; but believing that we did what was right.' They yielded finally to European influence, and resolved to sacrifice animals only. Human sacrifices, in that part of India, seem to have ceased in 1854; but they are still offered in Africa, in Polynesia, and perhaps in certain parts of Asia.

What is the origin of this custom? Sacrifice contains the element of offering. As presents are offered to the princes of this earth to conciliate their favour, the idea arose of offering gifts to gods. But the element of offering is not the only one contained in sacrifice; there is also that of atonement. This remark was made in 1870 before the International Anthropological Congress of Bologna, by M. Vogt, professor of the University of Geneva. I lean upon this authority in preference to every other, because no one will suspect this savant and myself to have entered into an agreement to falsify facts in the interest of dogmatics. When once the idea of atonement is introduced in that of sacrifice, 'the value of the chosen victim will be great in proportion to the greatness of the unatoned fault,'[1] and one can understand that man has considered his fellow-creatures as the most precious of victims. The testimony of historians confirms this opinion. Up to the period of their conversion to Christianity, the Gauls offered human sacrifices; Julius

[1] See *La Revue Scientifique* of 8th Sept. 1877.

Cæsar said 'that they thought it necessary to sacrifice men in order to appease the gods' (*non posse aliter deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur*).[1] Fernando Cortes, in conversation with a native chief of Tlascalus, learned from him 'that the Mexicans could form no idea of a true sacrifice unless one man died for the salvation of others.'[2] The frightful custom originated by a religious sentiment has been favoured by cannibalism. Cannibalism is sometimes the outcome of famine, often perhaps, but not always. It is practised in countries where nourishment abounds. It has its origin in other causes than the want of food, and human sacrifice is, perhaps, one of these causes. Victims were eaten *because* they *had been* killed; other victims were killed *to be* eaten. Ceremonies which at first may have had the impress of superstition, became nothing less than frightful repasts; after which men, fallen below the level of brutes,

> 'Wrangled together
> Over bleeding fragments and horrid limbs.'

The religious idea had disappeared, smothered under heaps of carcases, and drowned in a pool of blood.

Reflect, gentlemen, and consider the profound mystery contained in the fact of man killing man for the atonement of his own sins. We can understand the sacrifice of offerings; we can understand how creatures macerate themselves, sacrifice themselves with the idea of atoning for their sins, and of appeasing the wrath of

[1] *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 16.
[2] Antonio Solis, *Histoire de la conquête du Mexique.*

the gods; but that the idea of atoning for one's faults by sacrificing one's fellow-creature has ever existed and become one of the causes of a general custom, is a thing we cannot understand. Truly the Christian doctrine of redemption is mysterious; but to my mind it is not much more mysterious than the idea of atonement involved in human sacrifices. The difficulty is the same for the intelligence. Only, on the one hand, it is a mystery of madness and of cruelty, and on the other hand, it is a mystery of devotedness and of love.

The custom of human sacrifices has therefore been widely spread; how has it disappeared? Will any civilisation account for this? No. Historians discuss as to the number of human victims sacrificed by the Mexicans, victims which were obtained by maintaining incessant wars. Their number is generally estimated at twenty thousand yearly. All those victims were eaten, and formed a considerable portion of the support of the people of the capital. Mexico, in many respects, was nevertheless civilised. A curious document has been preserved, containing the advice of a Mexican mother to her daughter. She speaks of the duties of a woman, of a wife, of a mother, with accents of serious tenderness, which the heart of a Christian would not disavow; and she intermixes with serious lessons on respect and chastity, advice on dress and on deportment, which implies a civilisation not only real, but nearly refined.[1] Well, gentlemen, when this well-educated

[1] *History of the Conquest of Mexico*, by William Prescott, vol. iii. App. i.

young lady attended a religious festival in the bosom of her family, one of the important features of the festival was a banquet, and the principal dish of the banquet was the body of a slave sacrificed for the ceremony, and prepared with great care. The history of the world contains few contrasts more striking and more painful than that offered by an unrestrained cannibalism in the bosom of the civilisation of a worthy people, in many respects deserving of sympathy and regard.

Among the Greeks and the Romans the public sacrifice of men belongs to a remote period; but when they were forbidden on the public places, they found a refuge in the mysteries. One of Horace's poems[1] leads to the belief that, even in his time, in secret, impure ceremonies, children were put to death in a most horrible manner. In the works of Pliny the Elder, who was nearly contemporaneous with Jesus Christ (he was born A.D. 23), we discover the expression of real joy on the occasion of an imperial edict for the abolition of human sacrifices.[2] That edict was not always put in force, for the Emperor Commodus, who ascended the throne A.D. 180, sacrificed children in the mysteries of Mithras, into which he had been initiated. The natural development of the intelligence and of the heart has truly, nearly everywhere, with the exception of Mexico, diminished the number of human victims, and proscribed their public sacrifice; but the total extinction of those sacrifices has been brought about merely by two influences: in one part of Asia by

[1] Epode V. [2] Quoted in Prescott's *Mexico*.

the influence of Buddah, a prodigious man, of whom I shall have to speak; and in the remainder of the world by the influence of Jesus Christ.

Christianity in this relation has a twofold action. It stops the shedding of blood by elevating the ideas, by tempering and purifying the morals. In this respect its work is only that of the reason and the heart cultivated and fortified. Then—and this is its special feature—it satisfies the element of conscience involved in the atonement; it holds back those hands raised on the victims consecrated to idols, it holds them back in the name of the great Victim, Who has voluntarily offered Himself for the sins of the whole world. At this very day, in Africa and in the Polynesian Islands, the preaching of the gospel puts an end to the sacrifice of man by man. Listen to this account, given by a modern traveller, of a visit to the Society Islands: 'We went to visit the Maraïs, or sacred stones, the last vestige of the religion of the country. At our leisure we examined this place, stained with so much blood shed in the name of religion. . . . That which rendered human sacrifices so strangely horrible in the Society Islands, is the fact that those unfortunate victims were always selected from certain families set apart, from generation to generation, for that special object. How had such a caste of born victims come into existence? I know not. Numbers of these families made arrangements to embark secretly in canoes and to gain the open sea, preferring to run the risk of being drowned or of

dying of hunger to the horrible uncertainty of the fate which always hung over them. When a person solicited the priest for some heavenly, or rather infernal, favour, he was told that the gods demanded a human sacrifice, and, naming the victim, the applicant received the power of death in the form of a sacred stone. He then carefully hid this stone upon his own person, and, gathering together a few of his friends, he sought out the appointed victim. Assisted by his friends, he would succeed in discovering the unfortunate one seated under some tree, or repairing his canoe, and drawing near to him, conversed about rain, or fine weather, or fishing, etc. Then suddenly he would open his hand and show the fated man the sacred stone. Terrified, the victim would attempt to escape; a short struggle would ensue, the victim thrown down, garotted, and carried to the pitiless priests. Oh how horrible the scene must have been! Sometimes these unfortunate ones would succeed in making their escape, would reach the mountain, and live and die there unknown and ignored. The weather was too warm to bring on a fit of shivering, but the shade of large trees, and the calm beauty of the scenery around, made the history of the site still more horrible' (*British Review*, August 1872).

This is not an account given by a missionary, nor even by a serious man; it is that of a young English lord, who speaks very lightly of morals, and sometimes almost impiously of religion; but in the presence of the abolition of human sacrifices, the work of Christian

missions, his smile disappears, and his lips, full of emotion, utter the words we have just quoted.

The death of Christ has been the most powerful cause of His action in the world. He had not gone beyond the narrow limits of Palestine; it is from the summit of His cross that His work has irradiated the universe. Whatever may be the dogmatical meaning attached to His death, that death has been, and still is, the temporal life of thousands of human beings.

The doctrine of the cross, I mean the doctrine of redemption, is the firmest prop of moral and religious truth. I said, in my second lecture, that Monotheism would not have been firmly established and maintained but for the influence of Christian preaching; we may now, perhaps, discover the reason of this fact. The doctrine of the cross operates in two ways: for the conversion of men, and to retain them in the domain of the faith.

And, firstly, for the conversion of men. Behold Paul, the great missionary, at Corinth, at Athens, at Rome! He knows that the inhabitants of those great cities have heard the words of the wise. He quotes a verse from a Greek poet, and the works of Socrates and of Plato are probably not unknown to him. Nevertheless, after all the teaching of the wise, he finds the idols still standing, and the corruption of morals increased rather than diminished by the worship given to those false divinities. At his word the idols begin to shake upon their foundations. Is it not natural that he should exclaim, 'For after that in the

wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. The foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men'? (1 Cor. i. 21, 25).

Vinet has remarked that if Christianity is made to appear more reasonable by suppressing the doctrine of redemption, it is robbed of its virtue. This may appear surprising, but the statement is justified by facts. Does it not seem natural, when speaking of brutalized savages, to say, 'Before we make them Christians, let us make men of them'? The attempt has been made. English philanthropists, under the auspices of Wilberforce, have undertaken the civilisation of some of the natives of Western Africa without the assistance of a direct religious action. The attempt has failed. One of the governors of Canada has attempted a similar mode of procedure with the Indians, without obtaining any good result. Attempts at civilisation, where the religious element has been wanting, have not succeeded.

Other men have used religion, but have commenced by what is called natural religion,—God, and the immortality of the soul,—withholding provisionally those dogmas which are specially Christian. This work was undertaken in America by some of William Penn's disciples; it has been prosecuted for a century and a half; it has completely failed. A missionary relates that he had adopted a similar plan. He had spoken to a heathen about God and providence without

obtaining any result. By a sudden impulse he opened the New Testament, and read the account of our Saviour's passion. The heathen began to weep, and was soon won over to the faith.[1]

And, now, here are some facts which I know too imperfectly to relate in all their details with any degree of assurance. I have heard that some Indian Brahmans endeavour to interpret their religion in the sense of Monotheism, to turn away their countrymen from the worship of idols, and to bring them to God, but not through Christ, the Way. The Japanese Government has, I believe, conceived a similar idea. What will all these attempts result in if they are seriously carried out? I make many provisions with respect to this, but it is useless to mention them. I will remain on the solid ground of history, and I will now show you the result of attempts made to retain in the bosom of Christendom those who withdraw therefrom, by eliminating from the ideas of the faith the central dogma of redemption.

An aged tree becomes covered with moss and mistletoe; a house as it grows old deteriorates: that is the destiny of earthly things. And by the very fact that religion manifests itself in humanity, time introduces defects and abuses into it. It comes to pass that those defects and abuses are in danger of alienating men who are not hostile to the foundations of the faith. From thence arise those attempts at reform which have been made to prevent or recover

[1] Poulain, *L'œuvre des missions Evangéliques*, Geneva, 1867.

any defections. Those attempts are of two kinds. Some remain within the limits of the fundamental Christian doctrine. I have not here to speak of these; that would be to enter into those confessional controversies which my programme excludes. The aim of others is to preserve religion, by eliminating Christianity, properly so called. 'Tis of these I must speak. Three principal attempts have been made in modern times: in 1796, at Paris, the religion of the Theophilanthropists, which reduced its precepts to two, 'Honour God,' 'Love mankind,' and which excluded the marrow of the gospel; in 1830, the French Church founded by Abbé Châtel, which had for device, 'The natural law, nothing but the natural law, all the natural law,' and which was in full reaction against Christianity; in 1844 arose the Church of the German Catholics, whose most pretentious apostle was Jean Rouge, who might have been for a moment regarded as a modern Luther, but who walked in a path which led him rapidly into Pantheism. Those attempts at the formation of new religions have had three characteristics in common. They despoiled religion of the idea of a special intervention and of a redemptive act of God. Their momentary splendour was followed by a rapid decay. They all compromised themselves in political movements. Time fails me to retrace the history of these three attempts. I shall simply sketch the fate of the oldest, that of the Theophilanthropists.

On the 26th Nivose, year v. (December 1796), five

fathers of families met in Paris, in the Rue St. Denis, No. 34, and at the close of their meeting published a manifesto containing the following words: 'Several fathers of families, convinced that religious principles are the only solid basis of a good education, the only check to secret crimes, the best consolation in adversity, the most effectual encouragement to every duty, have met to discover the means of saving their children from the dangers of irreligion. They have considered that mysterious religions have many adversaries; that the greater number of young men brought up in these do not, when they go out into the world, resist the numerous arguments by which they are attacked; and that, by renouncing the mysteries, they often, at the same time, forget religion and morals. Consequently, they have thought that the surest way was to train their children in the principles of natural religion, which no man can attack, unless he be foolish or altogether corrupt; that, once accustomed to regulate their lives upon the principles of this religion, which every nation respects, and which is the basis of all the religions of the world, they would in all probability never renounce it, and would thus be good men unto their life's end.'[1]

Such is the nature and aim of that attempt, exposed in the clearest manner. The question was to abide by the *credo* of Robespierre, which was, in Rousseau's opinion, the pure product of reason admitted by all the nations of the earth! It was thus that men

[1] *Manuel des Théophilanthropiques*, 1797.

hoped to retain or to bring back those whom the mysteries had alienated from religion. The attempt was an honest one. The Theophilanthropists reckoned among their adherents a few men of mark, Dupont de Nemours, and Bernardin de St. Pierre, the amiable author of *Paul et Virginie*. The sect was favoured by the government. They were permitted to share with the Catholics in the use of several of the Paris churches, notably that of Notre Dame. But, as many attended only through curiosity, and others with the sole aim of protesting against Catholicism, the crowd soon thinned away. Curiosity soon tires; and, for the mere purpose of protesting, men do not long endure the tediousness of a religion to which they do not attach faith. Congregations had been formed in the French provinces and in Italy; but soon zeal languished everywhere; the churches were empty; money was not forthcoming; intestine quarrels broke out; and Chemin, the principal founder of the institution, declared, with grief, in a memoir which he published, that 'theophilanthropy had been professed by men who were not animated by the love of the truth or the zeal of virtue, and who had forsaken it when they had been convinced that there was no money to be earned or places to be obtained in it.'[1]

The two other similar attempts that I have mentioned have met with the same fate. Men hoped to bring back to religion those who had been alienated from it, by suppressing the mysterious elements of the

[1] Gâchon, *Histoire de la Théophilanthropie*, p. 26.

faith, and especially the doctrine of redemption, which is its central mystery. Men thought to make religion harmonize with modern culture; experience has proved the folly of this step. This may perhaps astonish you. It does seem easier to bring the minds of men to the ideas of God, and of the judgment to come, than to that of the sacrifice of Christ. The religion of Rousseau seems easier to maintain than that of the gospel. It is not so, however. The foolishness of the cross is more powerful than our wisdom. Your astonishment does not destroy this fact; it simply establishes it. I have shared that astonishment; I share it still, to a certain extent; but, if I mistake not, here is the explanation of the phenomenon.

In order to act, man needs joy and hope. When the conscience is developed (this is the condition of attachment to a religion; if conscience be asleep, men go elsewhere than to church), the sense of sin produces sorrow, and sorrow brings forth discouragement. Now, discouragement is that illness of the soul which dries up the springs of life and action. Restore hope, and you will restore courage. That is precisely the effect of the doctrine of pardon. That is why that doctrine acts so powerfully upon the soul of the heathen. Go to those poor savages whose mouths are full of human flesh, and whom their conscience, as soon as it is awakened, reproaches for their past cruelty and impurity. Speak to them only of God, of His law, of His justice, your message will not be for them the beam that enlightens, but the thunderbolt that destroys.

Tell them of a God that justifies sinners, and their hearts will be softened. And we, gentlemen, who have not upon our consciences cannibal repasts, do we not need a word of pardon, which shall remove the heavy burden of our past, and become the starting-point of a new life?

A vague and general idea of the goodness of God cannot replace that central doctrine of the gospel. To speak of the goodness of God without paying due regard to His justice, is to weaken the conscience. When men enter into this path, they soon say to themselves, 'Sin is not so black as it is represented; God is a good Father, who knows our weakness, and does not demand too much from it.' Then the mind enters into a road that leads to ruin; because the holiness of the law being covered with a veil, the moral order is attacked in its very source. Place yourselves, on the contrary, before the cross, where the goodness of God, Who forgives, is manifested by a sacrifice. That is assuredly a mystery; but you will not be able to meditate upon that mystery without seeing in it the holiness of the law, the gravity of sin, and the extent of supreme mercy indissolubly united. Then the two pillars of morals—justice and love—will remain standing.

If this doctrine is necessary for the present life, seeing that it supplies the springs of hope and of courage, it is not less necessary, it is even more needful, in order that we may die in peace. Draw near to this dying man. His conscience speaks; he

believes that there is something beyond the veil of death. The thought of justice alarms him; the vague idea of the goodness of God does not satisfy his anguished conscience. If you do not bring him the message of pardon, what will you say to him? He is going to die. I am not ignorant of the fatal illusions which the prospect of conversion at the last hour can give rise to. Without any doubt, it will not suffice, in order to redeem a whole life of selfishness, of sensuality, and of lying, to recite devoutly a few verses of the Bible, to make the sign of the cross, or to kiss a crucifix. I know the strong language that Saurin, the great Protestant preacher, used to censure the cowardly complaisance of certain ministers of the gospel, forgetful of their Master's interests, when at the bedside of the dying.[1] But, as far as the human eye can penetrate such secrets, there are real conversions at the last hour; there are criminals touched with genuine repentance, to whom can be applied the word of comfort that the Crucified One addressed to him who was crucified by His side: 'To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise' (Luke xxiii. 43).

That is the secret of the power of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; that is the reason why, if we do away with it, the salt of the gospel loses its savour; that is why, for the discouraged sinner, it is the pledge of pardon, the condition of recovery, of hope, of strength, and of life.

Habit alone prevents us seeing the strange con-

[1] Second sermon on 'The Postponement of Conversion.'

junction of terms in the following form of speech: *the cross of honour*. Monarchs confer crosses, as marks of distinction, upon the men whose merit they are desirous of recognising, upon those courtiers who enjoy their favour, or upon those persistent parasites whom they want finally to shake off. The cross figures on the crowns of kings, and on the spires of churches. Switzerland and Italy have placed upon their standards a red cross on a white ground; and a red cross on a white ground is the sign of the neutrality of ambulances. All this is not to us a matter of surprise; and yet, in the beginning, the cross was the tree of infamy, the instrument of torture for slaves and for the most unprincipled wretches. In order to place you before the perception of reality, strip the cross of its gold and of its diamonds; do not gaze upon it as it is delineated on the blue sky at the turning of the mountain path. Behold a tree of death, a man nailed to that tree, in the last sufferings of a prolonged agony, the blood falling drop by drop; and imagine that in taking a walk through our city gates you could see such a spectacle. That was the case up to the reign of the Emperor Constantine. For three centuries the cross was an object of horror, a mark of infamy. From thence the scoffings of the heathen. In searching the site of the palace of the Cæsars at Rome, a room was discovered which seems to have been devoted to the use of the emperor's pages. There is on the wall a rough sketch of a crucified man, having the head of an ass; under this drawing

are the following words, which leave no doubt as to the artist's intention: '*Alexamenus worships his god.*' Even the converted heathen could not rid themselves of a feeling of disgust and of fear at the instrument of torture which they beheld daily. It is probably on this account that in the most ancient paintings of the catacombs, where so many allegorical figures are found, the cross is not to be seen, or is hidden among other figures. Nevertheless the cross has become the sign of Christians, the most extended and the most honoured symbol of their faith. Whence has come this marvellous change? The cross consoles the disciple by recalling the sufferings of the Master; the remembrance of the Master's sufferings helps the disciple to bear his own. The cross teaches how to die. This is the thought which inspired Lamartine, in his poem on the 'Crucifix':

> 'To brighten the horrors of his narrow way,
> To uplift Godwards their downcast eye,
> Comforter Divine, whose dear sign we kiss,
> Answer, what to them dost Thou say?
> Thou knowest, Thou knowest how to die!'[1]

How well He knows how to die, He Who in the horrors of a fearful agony recommends His mother to the disciple whom He loved (John xix. 26); prays for His murderers (Luke xxiii. 34); then peacefully commits His soul into the Heavenly Father's hands (Luke xxiii. 46). What an example! Truly, sirs, I do not undervalue either the consolations or the lessons of the cross; but the explanation of the destinies

[1] *Nouvelles méditations poétiques.*

of this sign of horror and of ignominy must be drawn from a still deeper source. It is upon the cross that the pledge of pardon is nailed. It is from thence especially that its power comes, because it responds to all that is most serious and profound in the soul of man, the conscience.

FIFTH LECTURE.

Christ the Legislator.

GENTLEMEN,—In the year 1842, M. Troplong, a much esteemed contemporary jurist, read a memoir, before the Institut de France, on the civil right of the Romans. He concluded it with these words: 'Christian philosophy is the basis of our social existence; it nourishes the root of our laws; and though all men seek not to take account of this, we live far more by it than by the ideas that have escaped out of the ruins of the Greek and Roman world.'[1]

In other words, our civilisation springs from manifold sources; it proceeds in part from the Greeks and from the Romans; but of all the influences which have contributed to its formation, the most considerable is that of Christianity. Nevertheless Jesus Christ had no political power, nor did He desire any. There were certain Jews who, longing to be delivered from the Roman yoke, wanted to make Him the leader of an attempt at emancipation, and proclaim Him king;

[1] *Séances et travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques*, vol. i. p. 316 (year 1842).

He escaped out of their midst (John vi. 15). He refused to exercise civil functions. One of His followers said to Him one day, 'Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me.' But Jesus said unto him, 'Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?' He would not consent to take the place of tribunals, but He seized the opportunity to teach a lesson on covetousness (Luke xii. 13–15). Finally, He told the Roman governor that He was a King, but that His kingdom was not of this world (John xviii. 33–37). This absence of all social power which was the condition of Christ, was also the condition of His Church for three centuries. Christians were not admitted into the councils of the empire; they organized themselves, per force, outside the state, and under persecution. Nevertheless, this King, Who was not of this world, has exercised upon the world an influence more considerable than all the legislators and all the political bodies which have the right to make laws, and the power to put them in force. How is this?

In order to thoroughly understand this subject, we must establish a distinction between the faith in virtue of which men united to Jesus Christ form themselves into a society whose expectations go beyond this world, and the principles, sprung from that faith, which concern the temporal life of societies, and which become the basis of civilisation. Now, there is a Christian civilisation. Apart from doctrine and worship there are Christian peoples. This appellation appears almost

derisive when one considers the conduct of individuals and the policy of states. It has, however, a serious meaning. It designates nations in which, under the influence of the gospel, laws, institutions, and customs have appeared which distinguish them clearly from Buddhist countries, and from the people that have been subdued by the sword of Mahomet.

How has Jesus Christ exercised His work of legislatorship? In order to answer this question, we must study the bearing of a principle which He laid down. One day, in order to entrap Him, He was asked, 'Is it lawful to pay tribute unto Cæsar, or not?' If He had said yes, the patriots impatient of the yoke of the foreigner would have turned against Him; if He had said no, He would have become the head of a revolutionary movement. He replies: 'Show me the tribute money. They brought unto Him a penny, and He said unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto Him, Cæsar's. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's' (Matt. xxii. 15–21). Thus He evaded the snare; but was that all? One must be seriously afflicted with intellectual near-sightedness not to see that He took occasion of this incident to promulgate a transforming principle of society. He establishes a distinction between two domains and between two powers: God, the Master of consciences; Cæsar, the master of things temporal. Cæsar is the state, personified in an emperor, or a king, or represented

by the vote of an assembly or of a people. Now, in the ancient world these two domains were not distinct. The Roman Empire allowed every one to follow the religion that he preferred, but on condition that they should take part in the official worship, and bow down before the statue of the emperor. A similar state of things obtains in modern China. The practice of all religions is free; but all public functionaries are bound to take part in the ceremonies of the official religion; and it is the prohibition of attending such ceremonies which exposes Christians to persecution. When the temporal and the spiritual are thus confounded, one never knows exactly whether it is the state that rules religion, or the priests that are the masters of the state. Jesus Christ utters this word, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' This is the new principle. What pertains to Cæsar is things earthly. Cæsar demands especially money: Christians will faithfully pay tribute. Cæsar claims obedience: the disciples of Christ will obey him in all things within his domain; when persecuted, however great their number, they will not revolt. What pertains to God is the conscience; and when emperors will seek to be worshipped, all their power will be broken against the absolute resistance, not only of men in the prime of life, but of old men, of women, of maidens. The spiritual order and the temporal order are thus clearly distinguished, whence two consequences.

The first is the enfranchisement of the religious

conscience. Civil laws must be obeyed, that is the condition of the existence of society; but there is a law superior to the laws of men, as Sophocles well knew,[1] a supreme law, which ought to be obeyed before every other. If Christianity has proscribed revolt, it has also prescribed resistance, energetic and inflexible, when conscience is wronged. This distinction has been too often disregarded. I fear that in monarchical states there are still to be found disciples of the philosopher Hobbes, who wanted the monarch to be the absolute master of men's consciences; and I have read quite recently on the walls of a democratic city, that shall be nameless, a placard calculated to inspire serious reflections. This placard claimed, in the name of a very powerful political party, 'the sovereignty of the people in matters of religion.' Still, though too often misunderstood in its legitimate consequences, the word of Christ abides as an imperishable seed of liberty. It exercises its influence even on those who refuse to realize it, for one often sees that the adversaries of religious liberty dare not attack it except by usurping its name, and covering themselves with its mantle.

The first consequence of the distinction established by Christ is the liberation of consciences enslaved by the political power; the second is the enfranchisement of civil society. Among Jesus' disciples were two young men, the sons of Zebedee. The mother of these youths, having heard tell of the glorious destinies of

[1] *Epidus, King,* the Chorus.

the Messiah, and foreseeing that He might probably possess the temporal power which many of His contemporaries attributed unto Him, came to Jesus and said, 'Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on Thy right hand, and the other on the left, in Thy kingdom.' Jesus Christ answered: 'The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister' (Matt. xx. 20–28). He lays down this principle, then, that in the society He is instituting, the greatness of men will be measured by the services rendered. When He speaks of the kingdom of heaven, He speaks with authority, as a witness of things divine; but with respect to the things of earth, He declines all authority; He wishes only to use an influence that is freely accepted. He therefore repudiates all material compulsion used in the name of religion. Such is, on this subject, what may be termed Christ's programme. His influence upon society was to be purely moral. In order to understand the nature of that influence it will be necessary to take a glance at Christian morals.

In the book of Deuteronomy we read: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength' (chap. vi. 5); and in the book of Leviticus: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (chap. xix. 18). The Jews, who were the most advanced in religious knowledge, had joined these two passages together. One day Jesus Christ asked a

ruler what was most important in the law, and he replied by citing the texts that I have just recalled to your mind. Jesus approved him, and in adopting the summary of the law enunciated by the Israelitish doctor, Jesus added to it two reflections. He affirmed that the second commandment is like unto the first, and that the whole law hangs upon these two commandments (Luke x. 25–28; Matt. xxii. 35–40; Mark xii. 28–31). The apostles often reproduced similar thoughts: 'He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law' (Rom. xiii. 8). 'All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Gal. v. 14); thus St. Paul expressed himself. St. James taught the same truth also in the same way: 'The royal law is, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (chap. ii. 8). Let us endeavour to grasp the meaning of these two affirmations added by Jesus to the summary of the law.

The second commandment is like unto the first; it is merely its development. 'Thou shalt love thy God.' What God? The Father of every human being. To love Him is to do His will. What is His will? The good of all His children. One cannot therefore love Him without labouring to promote the good of all; the love of our neighbour is the direct outcome of the love of our Heavenly Father. Moreover, Jesus frequently declares that every act of worship which has not for result the good of men is vain. Such is the law of charity in the general sense of the term. Charity is not merely beneficence, almsgiving, but it is

the fruitful and energetic love of man which must always subsist, commence here below, expand beyond the veil of death, and form the bond between earth and heaven (1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13). Before he can enter upon this path of charity, he who is inclined to selfishness needs to be converted; hence, the necessity of conversion is the corner-stone of Christian morals. But man is not alone; nothing can take place in his conscience which does not exert an influence upon society. The conversion of individuals is a focus whose radiations transform the laws, the institutions, and the morals of society.

The second affirmation of Jesus is, that all duties are included in the twofold commandment of love to God and men. Moralists have proposed various classifications of duties. The best is, I think, that which reduces them to three: dignity, justice, benevolence. Now these three are included in the law of charity taken in its general sense. The will of the Creator is that men should form one society of happy spirits, in which every one shall labour to promote the welfare of others. Such is the statement of the supreme law. We may deduce from it—1°. The duties of *dignity:* God wills that His children should realize the exigencies of a spiritual nature in order that they may form a society of spirits and not of animals; 2°. The duties of *justice:* each one ought to respect in others a nature similar to his own; 3°. The duties of *benevolence:* we must not only recognise the rights of our neighbour, but, conformably to the divine

will, we must voluntarily labour for his good. Dignity, justice, benevolence: such are the three secondary rays into which the beam of charity divides itself. I wish to point out the social action of Christianity in this threefold relation, by showing what needed to be done in the world when the gospel appeared, and what has been done. The subject is a vast one. I shall limit myself to three examples. For *dignity*, I have chosen the combats of the gladiators, because it seems to me that to find a source of amusement in the sufferings and death of one's fellow-creatures is to strike the most fearful of all blows at the dignity of human nature. My second example shall be slavery, which is the most radical negation of justice. With respect to benevolence, I shall point out the relative indifference of antiquity to the miserable. Let us develope these three examples, commencing with the last.

Man has a heart naturally compassionate, and in which pity is never absolutely extinct. J. J. Rousseau, with that *nuance* of exaggeration habitual to him, called attention to a real fact when he wrote: 'The robber who strips the passengers will yet clothe the poor; and the most ferocious assassin will support a fainting man.'[1] One meets always and everywhere with kind-hearted people, with acts of beneficence, and charitable institutions; but the superiority of Christian beneficence over that of the ancient world is incontestable. Among many proofs that might be cited in support of this assertion, this one will suffice. It is

[1] *Profession de foi du Vicaire Savoyard.*

taken from the works of the Emperor Julian, in which these words occur: 'It has come to pass, as I believe, that the negligence of our priests with respect to the poor has suggested to those impious Galileans the idea of applying themselves to beneficence. What has most contributed to the progress of impiety is beneficence towards strangers, the care given to the sepulchres of the dead, and a feigned holiness of life. We must, I think, really practise each of these virtues. . . . It would be surely shameful, when none of the Jews beg, when these impious Galileans feed not only their poor but ours, that we should be found neglecting our necessitous ones. . . . Instruct the Hellenes to contribute to these works of beneficence.'[1]

Behold, then, a declared adversary of the gospel bearing witness to the manifest superiority of evangelical beneficence! Nothing could be more decisive. The spirit of Christ fortifies compassion, and combats the evil inclinations that are opposed to it. In all religions, in all systems of morality, one meets with precepts relative to benevolence; but in this respect Christianity possesses a special virtue, whose source is easy to recognise. The gospel—it is the pity of God, it is the mercy which absorbs justice. He who came to accomplish that work, the Redeemer, what does He ask in return for His self-sacrificing devotion? You know. Read over again that chapter in which Jesus depicts the judgment to come. The Master will say: 'When you fed the hungry, when you clothed the

[1] *Julian the Apostate*, by H. Andrien Naville, p. 163.

naked, when you visited those that were sick or in prison, what you did to them you did it unto Me' (Matt. xxv.). *There* is the source of the special action of the Christian doctrine for the development of goodness; it is this Saviour who takes to His own account (permit me this commercial expression) all that is done for the suffering members of the human family. The effect of these words has been immense. Our libraries contain thousands of volumes and millions of pages, but among all those pages there is not one that the miserable ought to moisten with tears of gratitude as much as that which I have recalled to your memory. I need not insist on this. The influence of Christianity on the development of compassion is so well known, that not only will no one dispute it, but it has sometimes been used as a reproach to religion. Yes, gentlemen, the gospel has been found fault with on the ground of the spirit of benevolence which cares for the weakly child, which conserves the life of the aged, and permits the infirm to consume sorrowfully a portion of nourishment at the expense of those who might enjoy life. They have insinuated the thought that it would be better to allow the feeble to die, in order that the race may be improved and the world made more joyous.

Pass in review all the works of beneficence, of succour, of relief, which have been started in the past or in the present, and ask yourselves who have been and who still are their originators? Among these agents of charity you will meet with kind-hearted men who have not directly come under the influence of the

gospel; but you will easily discover that the most zealous, the most active, the most persevering, are the disciples of Christ. Allow me to cite on this point a circumstance sufficiently characteristic. In 1835 I was present at a religious service held in the French Church founded by the Abbé Châtel. The assistants sprinkled the portrait of General Lafayette with holy water, and the whole of the ceremonies bore the stamp of a violent reaction against the traditional faith of Christians. Nevertheless, in the number of images recommended to the veneration of the faithful figured the portrait of Vincent de Paul. Vincent de Paul, a wonderful man, who has so clearly left his traces in the paths of beneficence, that I know not whether there be a single good work of which our century boasts which was not undertaken, or at least conceived and desired, by him. Now, from what source did Vincent draw the zeal which devoured his life without diminishing the number of his years?

The Christian faith is a seed whose fruit is charity. If this fruit does not appear, the seed is dead. The declarations of Christ are very explicit on this point. Faith produces beneficence; and, by a just return, the serious practice of beneficence may lead to faith. This is what Father Gratry relates: 'I know a great and well-known man who assures me that he became a Christian by this experimental way. "I attached myself," said he, "to some poor families, whom I have followed for many years in all the details of their life, asking myself, How shall I contribute to their well-

being? I saw that a moral progress depends on a religious progress. This was, in my eyes, an experimental science as certain as that of physical laws. I did more. I recommended the same task to some young men undecided in their convictions. I told them to undertake, without any prejudice or foregone conclusions, the regular and detailed study of a few poor families, and seek the cause and the remedy. Their conclusion was invariably the same; no progress of prosperity without a moral progress; no moral progress without religious progress.'' [1]

The charitable influence of Christianity has passed into the morals, and, in a certain degree, into laws. In this last respect the danger is, perhaps, lest too much be done. Works of benevolence ought to remain in the order of free actions. The law of charity is the principle of all good; but the charity of the law is big with inconveniences, because, save in exceptional cases, it is disastrous that the state quit its proper domain, which is that of justice.[2] This word justice leads me to pass on to slavery, which is the second object of our study.

Injustice is the negation of a right; slavery is the negation of all rights at once. The slave, in ancient society, was classed among *things*, and even amongst animals. He was handed over, without protection, to the cruelty of his master, and if the slave was a

[1] *Les sources*, by A. Gratry, 2d part, concl.

[2] Consult on this subject *De la charité légale*, by F. M. L. Naville, 2 vols., Paris 1836.

woman, to his lewdness. What has the gospel done in this matter? It has fortified the good elements in the reason and in the conscience, which had in vain raised objections to this enormous social iniquity. How has it proceeded? The Christians could not frame civil laws for the liberation of slaves, seeing they possessed not the power. Did they preach revolt? Their principles forbade them. Besides, less than a century before our era, Spartacus, at the head of 70,000 slaves who had revolted, covered Italy with fire and blood, and this vast insurrection, quelled by Pompey and Crassus, had probably embittered the lot of the wretches that had taken up arms. The gospel has reminded the world that the slave is a man, and that all men are brethren. Read the letter of the Apostle Paul to Philemon, on sending back to him a runaway slave; there you will find the charter for the abolition of antique slavery. The principle is laid down, the Church deduces the consequences. She cannot make civil laws, but she can promulgate ecclesiastical rules, the spirit and the bearing of which are manifest. The master is obliged to marry the slave he has seduced, an alliance altogether contrary to the morals and to the laws of antiquity. The master who has unjustly ill-treated his slave is excommunicated. It is prescribed to the slave to refuse to his master every act contrary to the law of God. When the Lord's Supper is administered, the Christian slave remains; the master, if he is only a penitent or a catechumen, must leave. The slave can be invested with an ecclesiastical character, and thus

become, in a spiritual point of view, the superior of his master.[1] It was thus that the Church laboured to ameliorate the condition of the slaves, and at the same time the influence of Christian sentiments suggested the idea of liberating them. Under Trajan, the prefect of Rome, Hermes, liberated one Easter Sunday 1250 slaves, and made to each of them a gift to ensure his sustenance. Under Domitian, another prefect of Rome, called Cromacius, liberated 1400 slaves who had been baptized, and said unto them, 'Those who begin to be the children of God ought no longer to be the slaves of men.' Attempts were made to reach the civil law; but the work was difficult and slow. It was necessary first to overcome the habits and the interests of the owners. Then came the barbarians, whose invasion, salutary in some respects, had also the fatal effect of superseding, by the idea of force, the ideas of justice and of right. Still the Christian spirit gradually bore its fruits; slavery was softened, modified, transformed. The work advanced, it was almost accomplished in Western Europe, when there occurred one of the saddest events in history. The Portuguese having taken prisoners some African Moors, the Mahometans came to Portugal to offer some negro slaves in exchange for their fellow-countrymen. This gave the Portuguese the idea of going in search of them themselves, and on the 8th of August 1444—accursed day!—the first slave-ship reached the coasts of Europe. This was the origin

[1] See E. de Pressensé, *La vie ecclésiastique, religieuse et morale aux 2e et 3e siècles*, book iii. chap. iii.

of the negro trade. This traffic afterwards assumed enormous proportions, in order to furnish negroes to the American Colonies; but it is incorrect to refer the origin of this abominable trade to the settlement of Europeans in the New World. When the first negroes were sold in Portugal, Christopher Columbus was a child. All the nations of Europe have participated in this iniquity. Portugal and Spain began; the English, the French, the Dutch, . . . followed their example.[1] Having been established in the Colonies, slavery, for a moment, invades Europe. In the year 1762, barely a century ago, negroes were sold in Paris. The thing is put beyond doubt by an order of the 'Duc de Penthièvre, Admiral of France; an order that was intended to put a stop to this crime, and in which one reads: "France, especially its capital, is become a public mart where men have been sold by auction to the highest bidder; there is hardly a tradesman or a workman who has not had his negro slave. We have been informed of many purchases of this kind, and we have had the pain of seeing many orders obtained and sworn before the lieutenant of police, by means of which several individuals have had their negroes constituted prisoners."'[2]

This evil was accidental and transient in Europe, but it installed itself in the United States with a fearful energy, and has lasted up to our time. At

[1] Consult on this subject, and on the general question of slavery, *L'abolition de l'esclavage*, by A. Cochin, vol. ii., Paris, 1861.

[2] *La Critique Philosophique*, of May 28, 1875, p. 252.

last the human conscience spoke out. It protested first against the traffic; then, under our own eyes, the emancipation of negroes in the United States was accomplished. Under our eyes, also, Russia has abolished serfdom, Brazil has proclaimed a wisely progressive law of liberation; and, with a few unimportant exceptions, it may be now said that the soil of the nations called Christian is clear of the scandals of slavery.

Under what influences were the efforts produced that brought about this result? In order to reply, it will not be needful to make laborious researches into ancient documents. The question is one of recent events, and everything is clear as daylight. Who were the men who, in the middle of last century, claimed and practised the emancipation of slaves? Some Quakers in America, who taught that slavery was contrary to the gospel.[1] Who pleaded the cause of the blacks in the British Parliament with the greatest fervour and perseverance? Pronounced Christians—Wilberforce and Buxton. What was the spirit that animated *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, that book which so powerfully influenced opinion in favour of the negroes? A thoroughly Christian spirit. To what feelings did the Czar of Russia appeal when he liberated twenty millions of men? Read his manifesto of the 19th of February 1861, which concludes with these words: 'And now, Christian and faithful people, make on thy forehead the sacred sign

[1] *Encyclopédie moderne* (Didot), art. 'Slavery.'

of the cross, and join your prayers to ours in invoking the blessing of the Most High on your first free toil.'

But did not the philosophy of the 18th century have a share in this work? Shall we enter to the credit of Christianity the decree of the Convention which liberated the slaves? Yes, gentlemen, without the least doubt. We have here an instructive example of the separation which may be effected between a civilisation and the faith that produced it. When one wishes to trace the sources of men's actions, it is much more needful to consider the influences that have moulded their spirit than the theories they profess. The Christian tradition had formed the 18th century; and the noble spirits of that epoch, even while breaking with the faith, professed their admiration for the morality of the gospel, under whose influence they had been brought up. Will you deny the reality of that influence? Will you talk of pure philosophy, of the simple culture of the reason? Yes. Well then, pray tell me why the philosophy of the Indians, of the Persians, of the Arabs, wanting neither in brilliancy nor in vigour, has not risen up against slavery? Is it a mere chance that the only philosophy which has taken part in this conflict was the philosophy of Christian nations? No, gentlemen, there is no chance here. The philosophers of the 18th century, when they laboured for the emancipation of the slaves, were serving the cause of Christianity. When the slaveholders of the United

States quoted the Bible in defence of their wicked cause, they opposed and betrayed the cause of the gospel.

Slavery is abolished throughout Christendom; but it still subsists, on a fearful scale, in Mahometan lands. Mahometan lands are the only ones now open for the sale of human flesh; and Islamism keeps this stain in all its repulsive loathsomeness. The Arabs and the Turks need slaves to work for them. They need mutilated slaves to guard their harems; and at this very moment, in Upper Egypt, they are laying in a stock of negro children whom they will mutilate, and the majority of whom will die from the effects of the operation.

Africa is infested with intestine wars, the aim of which is the capture and sale of the vanquished. What is done on a large scale by armed mobs, is done in detail by other means. Men-hunters prowl like wild beasts round the huts of the natives. When a child strays they seize and gag it, that it may not be able to scream for its mother; and if it survives the fatigues and the miseries of the journey, they take it to the market.[1] The number of slaves sold every year amounts to tens of thousands; and this number does not represent the faintest part of human beings captured. According to the most moderate estimates, for one negro that reaches the mart, at least four or

[1] A European traveller, L. B. Klunziger, obtained these particulars from a young negress who had been captured thus. *Les missions évangéliques au* 19*e siècle*, in a Neuchatel newspaper, Aug. 1877.

five die on the road. Travellers in Africa have gone through fertile districts, bearing traces of agriculture, and of a certain degree of civilisation. A few years later they have found the same districts deserted; the slave-merchants had captured and carried away the whole of the inhabitants. In these desolated regions there is a track that one may follow without losing one's way, because it is well defined by the bleached bones of slaves who have died *en route.*[1]

A society has been recently formed, under the auspices of the King of the Belgians, to put a stop to these horrors. I do not wish to detract from the merit of the King of the Belgians and of his honourable co-workers; but who is the principal initiator of this work? Who, traversing Africa, amid a thousand perils, saw sights which pursued him like a frightful nightmare, and sent up a cry of horror and appeal which resounded on both shores of the Atlantic? A Christian missionary—Livingstone. In his journal, among his geographical notes, he wrote sentences such as these: 'Jan. 1, 1871.—O Father, help me to finish my work to Thine honour.' 'Jan. 1, 1872.—May the Almighty grant me to finish my work this year! May He grant it for the sake of Christ!' And on the 14th of May 1873 he died in the hut of a savage, after having for a long time braved the attacks of a cruel malady. The negroes whose affections he had won found him stiff and cold on the edge of his

[1] Emile Banning, *L'Afrique et la conférence géographique de Bruxelles*, chap. iv.

couch in the attitude of prayer.[1] Livingstone was an English missionary and a Protestant. Allow me to point out, with respect to the abolition of slavery, the concord of the two great branches of Western Christendom. On the 1st of August 1838, by virtue of a decree of the British Parliament, the sun in rising upon the Antilles shone on free men only; and on the 3d of November 1839, a bull of Pope Gregory XVI. recalled to mind the efforts of his predecessors in favour of slaves, confirmed and completed their decisions, and pronounced, in a most solemn and peremptory manner, the absolute condemnation of slavery in all its forms.[2] From slaves let us pass to gladiators.

Travellers who visit Rome admire the ruins of the Coliseum, the largest circus ever constructed in the world. This was a theatre where fêtes of various kinds were held; but the most popular were combats in which men wounded and killed each other for the pleasure of the spectators. The gladiators were mostly prisoners and slaves, sometimes volunteers who had chosen that profession, and sometimes women! Many really enjoyed these sanguinary exercises; but the prisoners of war, the Gauls, the haughty Germans, often had an invincible horror of the *rôle* they were

[1] On Livingstone's tombstone in Westminster Abbey attention is called to the fact that the great traveller vowed to do all in his power to stop the slave-trade in Central Africa, that among his last written words were these: 'May the blessing of heaven descend on the man, be he American, English, or Turk, who shall help to heal this bleeding sore!'

[2] The text of this document is found in Cochin's *Abolition de l'esclavage*, Appendix xii.

made to play. In a single one of his letters, Seneca mentions three suicides of gladiators.[1] One pierces his own bosom with the sword they have just put into his hand, 'thus showing,' says the philosopher, 'that it is more laudable to die than to kill.' The second, a Gaul, finds a rod and thrusts it down his throat. The third puts his head between the spokes of a wheel, and crushes it, so that 'the chariot which dragged him to execution shielded him from it.' The combats of the gladiators cost enormous sums of money. They became, for the wealthy Romans, a means of electoral bribery. When a candidate wished to gain the suffrages of the people, he paid for a grand combat. The emperors were sometimes obliged to set limits to this means of influence, their political interests thus supplying the defect of their humane feelings.

Individual rich men not only presented these combats to the populace during their lifetime; they sometimes instituted them by will in honour of their memory. We know, for example, the last arrangements of two Romans who bequeathed for the combats of the circus, the one all the young men of his household, and the other his beautiful slaves.[2] Nor have I said all. There was, it appears, a very ancient custom in the Campania of enlivening their repasts by the spectacle of gladiatorial combats.[3] This custom had

[1] Letter lxx.

[2] Schmidt, *Essai historique sur la société civile dans le monde Romain*, p. 106.

[3] Livy, book ix. chap. 40.

spread in Italy, and was introduced wherever there were Romans rich enough to sacrifice men for the pleasure of their guests.[1] Pause before this fact. Imagine these prolonged banquets, where blood flowed out of wounds while the wine was poured into the cups of the banqueters! Picture to yourselves these butcheries of men, alternating with the lascivious dances of courtesans! And where did this take place? Among barbarous nations? No, sirs. This took place in the Roman Empire; among a people who appreciated the charms of the odes of Horace, and the sweet harmony of Virgil's verse; among a people in the midst of which the arts flourished; a people who founded the science *du droit*, and passed it down to us. Well, in that civilisation, advanced in so many respects, these gladiatorial combats were the chosen pleasures of the whole nation. The populace, the magistrates, the women, even the young women, crowded with enthusiasm into the Coliseum to see the flow of human blood. What morals! And it is not merely a question of morals; these combats were a public institution. There were gladiators maintained at the cost of the state, and these sports were placed under the inspection of an official commissioner, who was a high personage. Commodus himself descended into the arena; but, the coward! he alone was armed, and felled his victims with a club, thinking thus to imitate the combats of Hercules. Commodus, it is true, was only an impure and cruel beast clothed in the imperial

[1] Schmidt, p. 106.

purple; but Titus, the good Titus, the man who merited the surname of *The delight of the human race*,—Titus handed over the Jews that had been taken prisoners at Jerusalem for the combats of the circus. And what about the laws? There was a law of Augustus which forbade more than twenty men to fight at once, but even this was not observed. Such was the contempt of human life in the social centre when the gospel was preached.

The struggle of the Church was a long one. To oppose pleasures relished by the public is a difficult task; and the point here was to conquer a taste that had reached the force of a passion. This passion sometimes took possession of even good natures. This is evidenced by the history of Alipius, as related by his friend St. Augustine. Alipius had a horror of the bloody sports of the circus. One day, however, he was taken there almost forcibly by some of his friends; but in consenting to accompany them he resolved to keep his eyes closed. For a time he was faithful to this resolution; but suddenly a tremendous clamour is heard. What a shout was that which proceeded from the mouths of the 80,000 spectators which the Coliseum contained! Alipius opens his eyes; the blood was flowing. 'As soon as he had seen this blood he drank down deeply the ferocity of this spectacle; he did not turn away from it; he became intoxicated by a sanguinary voluptuousness. He was no longer the same man as when he came, despite himself; he was one of the throng, a worthy com-

panion of those who had brought him thither. He beheld, he shouted, he kindled; he carried with him thence the madness of returning.'[1]

Constantine prohibited the combats of gladiators, but the law was not carried into execution. The Emperor Honorius consented to celebrate the anniversary of his consulate by the sanguinary sports of the circus, January 1, 404. These are the last mentioned in history, and here is the immediate cause of the final abolition of these cruel spectacles. A religious youth named Telemachus went to the circus. When the signal was given for the fray, he rushed down into the arena to separate the combatants. They massacred this mar-sport; but the blood of the martyr for humanity did not flow in vain. It appears that the emperor's conscience was smitten. Honorius renewed Constantine's edict, and put it into execution.[2]

The gladiators have not reappeared, as did the slaves. The Spaniards have their bull-fights; the Middle Ages had their tournaments, to which knights went voluntarily to try their bravery and skill; but in no Christian state have the police tolerated fêtes where men killed each other for the pleasure of the spectators.

I have only given you a few examples, gentlemen, to remind you of the influence of Christianity in favour of dignity, of justice, and of benevolence. In the history of our civilisation, the lines of the good con-

[1] Augustine, *Confessions*, book vi. chap. viii.

[2] Moreri, *Le grand dictionnaire historique*, word 'Telemachus.'

verge on Christ, as do, in the *Transfiguration*, the lines of light manipulated by the genius of Raphael. At bottom we know this well; our sentiments, our language prove that we know it. Certain portraits of Louis XV. bear this inscription, *Rex Christianissimus* (the most Christian king). Why does this inscription call forth a bitter smile? Because of the crying contrast between the title of Christian and the conduct of that scandalous debauchee. The more a man makes profession of piety, the more exacting are we in regard to his conduct. Admit that pride shocks you more in a priest than in a cavalry officer, the abuse of drink in a minister than in a peasant, avarice or luxury in a bishop than in a man of the world. In this respect the adversaries of the gospel think and speak like its disciples. Religion is sometimes attacked by enumerating the vices of its professors. One never seems to notice that the condemnation pronounced upon the man is an homage paid to the doctrine which he professes, and to which he is reproached for being unfaithful, because it is well known that this doctrine faithfully followed would be a source of virtue.

The gospel which has formed our civilisation is the principle which maintains it. Why, then, is the Christian faith combated, not merely by men under the empire of evil passions, which will always be the case, but by generous minds which live in its spirit? Here is one of the reasons of this deplorable fact. It is that these men forget the precept of Jesus Christ: 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and

unto God the things that are God's.' For three centuries the Christian Church had no other basis than the faith of her members, no other resources than their voluntary gifts, no other relations with governments than the persecutions which she suffered. The faith made no conquests save by the influence of persuasion and devotion. But everything changes from the days of Constantine. The emperor found that the new religion was conquering his people, and he decided to profess it himself. Let us make a note of the difference between two orders of facts. The legislator ought to enact the laws that he deems most favourable to the welfare of a people. The influence of Christianity was then to pass from morals into laws. To give but one example: a prince whose conscience had been enlightened by the gospel was under the necessity of abolishing the combats of gladiators, as contrary to the laws of humanity. That is the legitimate influence of religion upon society. It elevates the moral level, and that elevation of the moral level is manifest by the production of better institutions and better laws. But Cæsar goes out of his domain in two ways: firstly, when he makes laws for things temporal, not because he deems them good in a social point of view, but because they are the laws of the Church; secondly, when he issues edicts relative to faith and worship; when Cæsar meddles with religion, there is always great peril for liberty of conscience. In fact, the essence of the law of the state is to impose obligations, not morally, but by

constraint. Cæsar bears the sword, and if he adopts or makes religious laws, he is always tempted to execute them by force. Hence persecution.[1] This, alas! is what has happened in Christendom. Notwithstanding the eloquent protests of the Fathers of the Church,—after a fugitive apparition of the *régime* of liberty of worship,—the Church only ceased to be persecuted to become the instigator of persecutors. It is true that the civil power held the keys of the prisons, and kindled the bonfires, and killed with the sword; but behind the civil power one could see the Church inspiring it, pointing out her victims, and justly held responsible for the evil done. This state of things has provoked a natural reaction. Men have demanded the enfranchisement of conscience; they have demanded that society be no longer subject to the temporal power of the clergy, by the transformation of ecclesiastical into civil laws; they have demanded, in a word, the *régime* of liberty. Hence a mighty struggle. In this struggle the spirit of liberty has too often transformed itself into a spirit of revolt. Many men, confounding what is perfectly distinct, impute to religious faith the crimes of fanaticism, and stand aloof from Christ because men have persecuted in His name. That is why a certain number of souls, naturally Christian, are wandering amongst the adversaries of the gospel.

The confusion of ideas is enormous. Listen! In

[1] I have treated this subject of religious persecution in a pamphlet, entitled *L'Eglise romaine et la liberté des cultes*, Geneva 1878.

the interests of religion men have used both sword and fire. On the employment of sword and fire, here is the express teaching of Christ. A Samaritan village refuses to receive Him; the disciples ask, 'Lord, wilt Thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?' The Master rebukes them, and says unto them, 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of' (Luke ix. 55, 56). When you read the history of religious persecutions, when you stand with horror face to face with racks, tortures, and the stakes of the inquisition, above those impious flames, above that criminal smoke, listen then to the Master's words, 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.' And higher still, in the calm serenity of the sky, above the word of condemnation, listen to the word of infinite mercy, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Luke xxiii. 34).

They knew not what they did, but we know. We know that they hindered for centuries the normal development of Christian civilisation; we know that they forged the most powerful weapons of which the enemies of religious liberty make use to-day. That is what Jesus thought of the employment of fire; let us see what He thought of the sword.

At the moment of His arrest, one of His disciples draws his sword to defend Him. 'Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword' (Matt. xxvi. 52). There you have the repudiation of every measure of violence. There are two things in this

word,—a command: 'Put up again thy sword into his place;' and a menace: 'They that take the sword shall perish with the sword.' The command has been slighted; and what about the menace? Let us rapidly turn over the pages of the history of France.

Aug. 24, 1572.—Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The counsellors of King Charles IX. persuade him to exterminate the heretics for the benefit of religion.

Oct. 22, 1685.—Revocation of the edict of Nantes. The counsellors of King Louis XIV. persuade him to expel the Protestants from his kingdom for the benefit of religion.

Continue! 1793.—The priests of all religions indiscriminately are persecuted; the simple members suffer the same fate. Whosoever calls himself after the name of Christ is thrown into prison, to fall now under the axe of the assassins, and now under the official blade of the guillotine.

The sword had been drawn for the benefit of religion. The ensanguined blade returned and smote those who drew it from its scabbard. The menace of Christ was a prophecy.

These miseries, gentlemen, will have an end. There will always be strifes and conflicts in the world; but if modern society does not overthrow with its own hands the foundations which support it, if the spirit of Christ, too long disowned, penetrates our institutions, we shall at length see disappear from the soil of Christian nations the last vestiges of that most odious of all things—religious persecution. In order

to this, what is necessary? To revert to the programme of Christ. Let the state keep in its domain, and religion in its own. 'Tis Cæsar alone, *i.e.* the state, that may employ force. Let him never consent to put it at the service of a Church for the oppression of conscience, and by this alone fact liberty of worship will be assured. Then, when the phantom of religious persecution shall cease to haunt men's minds, the Christian faith will be able to extend its social influence, now compromised. It will take it up again if Christians, faithful to the maxims of their Master, show themselves full of ardour for every work of beneficence, of liberty, and of justice; if in every good cause they are seen the first on the breach and the last at the toil. Thus they will bring back into their ranks, not all the adversaries of their faith, but numbers of generous spirits, whom a natural reaction against the abuses of the past has thrown out of their natural course.

SIXTH LECTURE.

Christ the Lord.

GENTLEMEN,—Christ did not announce Himself merely as the Comforter, the Saviour, the Redeemer. His disciples, in addressing Him one day, called Him 'Master' and 'Lord,' and He replied, 'Ye call Me Master and Lord, and ye do well, for so I am' (John xiii. 13). The Lordship He accepted was a universal Lordship. When He charges His disciples to diffuse His teaching, He says to them, 'Go and teach all nations;' and just before He had said, 'All power is given unto Me' (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19). The Apostle Paul, full of faith in His Master's declarations, affirms that Jesus has 'a name which is above every name' (Phil. ii. 9).

Realities which we are able to establish by experience do not seem to accord with these statements. In the midst of nations outwardly Christian, there are many men, of all classes of society, who refuse to acknowledge the sovereignty of Jesus Chtist; and among those who accept Him there are many weaknesses, inconsistencies, and miseries of every kind. Then, what are the recognised Christian nations

compared with the entire population of the globe? Statistics are difficult to obtain, and liable to numerous errors in civilised countries; one cannot therefore place much confidence in them when they refer to barbarous and savage lands. But contemporary savants estimate that our earth bears from thirteen to fourteen hundred millions of human beings, and that Christians form barely a third of that number.[1] The universal dominion of Christ is therefore very far from being realized. True; but we must not forget that, in speaking of His power, Jesus did not say that it would be immediately, nor even rapidly established. One of the figures He employed to illustrate the destiny of His work was that of a little seed, which only becomes a great tree by gradual development (Mark iv. 30, 32). He foresaw and predicted persecutions for the bearers of His word. He has not said that all men would receive that word. On the contrary! Some, said He, will hear it without understanding it; others will receive it with joy, but will reject it at the first persecution; and others will be hindered in their fidelity to it by the cares of life and the deceitfulness of riches (Matt. xiii. 3–8, 18–23). He announced that the evil represented by the tares would remain mixed with the good grain until the end of time (Matt. xiii. 24–30).

When a man is seized by a great idea, his first

[1] Max Müller, in his *Essays on the History of Religions*, p. 31, gives the following religious statistics:—Buddhists, 31·2 per cent.; Christians, 30·7 per cent.; Mahometans, 15·7 per cent.; Brahmins, 13·4 per cent.; Pagans (various), 8·7 per cent.; Jews, 0·3 per cent.

movement of enthusiasm leads him usually to believe in the immediate triumph of the cause he has espoused; then come deceptions and discouragements. There is nothing like this in Christ's mind; His aspect is full of calm and of assurance; He knows that His work will be done but slowly, and in the face of a thousand difficulties. For us who live but a few years, nineteen centuries are a long time; for a work which is to embrace the world and prepare eternity, nineteen centuries are as nothing. The aspect of Jesus when He beholds the issues of His power, partakes of the mode of vision of Him who is patient because He is Eternal.

It is important to remark that it is the power, more than the novelty of ideas and of sentiments, which forms the special characteristic of the gospel. The gospel is the restoration and not the creation of human nature. The conscience, the heart, the reason are realities obscured, but not destroyed, by the reign of evil. There is hardly a moral truth or a virtue the germ of which may not be met with in the writings of the ancients; but these germs are sterile. The sages had caught a glimpse of the unity of God; but the idols were still standing after the time of Socrates and of Plato. The Stoics had proclaimed the principles of right, and had risen to the idea of humanity; but they had not materially changed either laws or morals. Charity had found expression in the Indian scriptures,[1] and Cicero had given it its

[1] Rama, the hero of the poem entitled *Ramayana*, is often praised because he sought his happiness in the happiness of all creatures.

name ;[1] but the miserable were comparatively neglected in the pagan world, and the combats of the gladiators were the delight of the Roman people. In order to glorify Christ it is not necessary to depreciate the high moral worth of Buddha, to calumniate Socrates, or to vilify Regulus. His unparalleled glory is that, by the devotion of His whole life, and by His voluntary death, He has given life to the good elements of the human soul. It is in this especially that is manifest a power whose development we shall now study, looking at it in its triple relation to the establishment, the maintenance, and the diffusion of the Christian religion.

When we study the establishment of the doctrine of Jesus, and the degree of power which that establishment presupposes, let us not consider the globe in its entirety, nor even the Roman Empire; but, if it is agreeable to you, we will fix our minds upon one single city; let us see what took place at Corinth. Corinth was a city enriched by commerce, adorned with the product of arts, ennobled by literary culture, celebrated for its luxury and, alas! for its lewdness. Through one of the gates of this city enters Paul of Tarsus. Who was Paul of Tarsus? He was not, like Peter and John, a simple fisherman, but an educated man. He possessed the lore of the Hebrews, and he was not entirely ignorant of the literature of the

The Buddhist scriptures contain lessons of beneficence and forgiveness which recall the loftiest precepts of the Christian documents.

[1] Caritas generis humani.

Greeks. Still, as Bossuet said, he arrives in this polished Greece, the mother of philosophers and of orators, with a crude speech, with the accent of a foreigner.[1] And what was his profession? He was a weaver; he wrought with his hands the material of which tents were made, and thus earned his livelihood. And where in this superb Corinth did he take up his abode? With an artisan of the same trade as himself, a Jew who had been banished from Rome, with all his compatriots, by an edict of the emperor (Acts xviii. 1–3). Such are the conditions under which Paul enters Corinth. And what does he propose to the inhabitants of this city, celebrated for the corruption of its morals? A morality which stirs up all the evil passions of the human heart. In presence of the idols, and of the statues of the emperor that they were required to worship, he proclaims the spiritual sovereignty of an unknown Jew. And what is the new religion that he wants to substitute for the beautiful ceremonials of Greece? Truly Christianity has produced a splendid art. When one hears executed under the arches of a Gothic cathedral the grand works of sacred music, one may ask whether our arts are equal or superior to those of antiquity. It is a question of taste. In a general way, art is one of the elements of a civilisation that Christianity has modified, without affirming that it has perfected it. But when Paul went to Corinth, Christian art had not come into existence; it was to meet in poor

[1] *Panegyric of St. Paul.*

chambers that men had then to forsake those temples whose very ruins are so universally admired. Picture this tentmaker entering into that city where met the splendours of Grecian culture and the pomp of Roman power, with the intention of conquering it for the Crucified, whom he called his Master. He stays there eighteen months, and he there founds a numerous Church, the first fruit of the conquest of that city and of the empire.

In order that it might establish itself, the gospel had to triumph over difficulties and opposition from without; but that was not all. Think of the difficulties which arose even in the midst of the Christian communities. The corruptions of the human heart had entered with the men into the infant Church. Paul had to act very vigorously against an incestuous person (1 Cor. v. 1); he speaks of desecrations of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 21–34); of divisions in the assembly of the faithful (1 Cor. iii. 3, 4). In its beginnings, the Church was like a citadel besieged by enemies without, and betrayed by its defenders. Nevertheless, the gospel was established; and if one takes into account the strength of the obstacles it had to encounter, one marvels at the comparative quickness of the work.

One day the Emperor Nero had the frightful fantasy of setting fire to a certain quarter in Rome, either to give himself the pleasure of a grand spectacle, or to make room for new buildings. A great irritation manifesting itself among the people, he wished to

divert suspicion, and, profiting by the general hatred shown against the Christians, he accused them of being the authors of the conflagration. He had some crucified; he had others thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre; some others he caused to be covered with pitch, and used as living torches to light up his gardens. The historian Tacitus, in relating these facts, remarks that 'this execrable superstition'[1] (it is thus that he designates the Christian religion), restrained for a time, broke out afresh,[2] not only in Judea, where it arose, but in Rome, the sewer of the universe. It is under Nero, at the period when Paul died a victim and a martyr to his faith, that a grave historian speaks of the overflowing of the Christian doctrine. It is about the year 64 A.D., thirty years after the death of Jesus, that Tacitus, in speaking of the disciples of Christ, employs the term of 'great multitude.'[3] At the close of the second century, Tertullian addressed to pagans these bold words: 'We are but of yesterday, and yet we fill all your cities, your islands, your castles, your villages, your councils, your camps, your tribunals, the palace, the senate, the market-place; we only leave you your temples. Without taking up arms, without revolting, we would be able to fight you by simply separating from you; for if such a multitude were to leave you, to retire into some distant country, the loss of so many citizens of every degree

[1] Execrabilis superstitio, *Annals*, bk. xv. ch. xliv.
[2] Rursus erumpebat.
[3] Multitudo ingens.

would sufficiently punish you; you would be afraid of your solitude, of the death-like silence of the world. . . . Your most refined cruelties are useless. We multiply as fast as you cut us down; our blood is the seed of Christians.'[1]

Must we see here the exaggerations of an impassioned advocate? No, gentlemen. Before the time when Tertullian wrote, Pliny said to the Emperor Trajan, in a well-known letter, written on the occasion of the prosecutions against the Christians: 'The matter has seemed to me to be worthy of reflection, especially from the number of those who are threatened with the same danger. A multitude of persons of all ages, of all orders, of both sexes, are and will be every day implicated in this accusation. This contagious disease has not only infected the cities, it has reached the villages and the provinces.'

Pliny explains afterwards, that prior to the measures which he had taken, and which were beginning to produce their effect, the temples were almost forsaken, the sacrifices neglected, and that the victims found few purchasers. The cross of Christ had not been set up one hundred years when a Roman governor wrote these words.[2] Nothing indeed better demonstrates the large numbers of the Christians, and the influence they had acquired, than the adoption of the new religion by Constantine, who made of it the

[1] *Apology.*

[2] The death of Pliny is fixed at 115 A.D., or 82 years after the crucifixion of Jesus, which is fixed at 33 A.D.

official religion of the empire. Such, in a few words, is what concerns the establishment of the evangelical doctrine; these are the circumstances in which it was maintained.

Constantine had placed the Christian religion upon the imperial throne; but the ancient world did not hold itself as vanquished. The sceptre passed into the hands of Julian, a disciple of the philosophers and rhetoricians, an enthusiast for Greek literature, for Hellenic civilisation, for the memories of the past, and full of a profound contempt for the Galileans. He appealed to all the instincts of resistance that remained in society, threw into the scales all the weight of the imperial power, and waged a war against Christianity, all the more dangerous that it was artful and mitigated in its forms. Then came Mahomet, and an apostolate of the sword, whose success was prodigious. Mahomet died in the year of our Lord 632; only a century afterwards, in 732, Charles Martel had to fight, at Poitiers, the Mahometans, who, masters of Spain and Portugal, had crossed the Pyrenees, and were advancing into the heart of France.

To these attacks from without continued to be joined troubles from within. From the beginning, as we have seen, the corruptions of mankind had been introduced into the Christian communities. After Constantine, when Christianity had become the official religion, this was still worse. Whole masses of unconverted persons found it to their interest to enter the Church. They

took with them their habits, their passions, and their vices. To the action of interest was joined, alas! that of violence. Take up a little manual of chronology, and consult it at the date 777 A.D.; you will there find this line, 'Charlemagne compels the Saxons to accept Christianity.' This was the fact. The Saxons opposed to Charlemagne an energetic and persistent resistance, which was only finally overcome by numerous and bloody wars. The emperor commanded them to become Christians; and to the force of arms he added a force of another nature. The converts were served with copious repasts. I do not take my information from the writings of a pamphleteer hostile to Christianity, but from those of a serious and believing historian—Cæsar Cantu.[1] The alternative put before them was this: Die or eat! A great number of soldiers preferred to eat; they rushed to be baptized, and after baptism they sat down at table. The haughty chiefs offered a greater resistance. These facts make you smile, gentlemen. As they are at the same time odious and ridiculous, one has the choice of weeping or of laughing. You have chosen the more cheerful part; but what is the meaning of your smile? It results from your sense of the contrast between the end pursued—the conversion of souls—and the means employed. Your smile is a homage rendered to the grand thought of Christ, that the things of God cannot be imposed by the power of Cæsar. What is sad, and absolutely sad, is that these compulsory conversions

[1] *Histoire universelle*, vol. viii. ch. xv.

drove into the Church populations which, having been baptized with water, and not with the Spirit, took with them their immoralities and their superstitions. Nevertheless the Christian faith has survived. It carries in its breast a double force—of resistance to attacks from without, and of reform of internal abuses. This is why it has founded a unique and universal civilisation. Other civilisations, and there have been splendid ones, have had the fate of the flowers of the field; they have disappeared or are disappearing. What remains of the civilisations of Nineveh, of Babylon, or of the Egyptians? Some curiosities for our archæologists. What remains of Greece and Rome? Many things, no doubt, but only those that have entered into the current of Christian thought, and that have been developed with it. So much for those dead civilisations; the others are dying. The Emperor of China commands some millions of men, and considers himself as the first sovereign in the world; but one discerns everywhere in his empire traces of a past superior to the present. The Chinese civilisation is not, as it has been said to be, a congealed or a crystallized civilisation; it is a civilisation in a state of decadence, which offers the spectator no symptom of spontaneous revival. Ancient India has raised architectural monuments which are the admiration of travellers; it has produced a very large number of literary works, in which profound thoughts are often clothed in all the *éclat* of beauty. The source of its great inspirations seems to have run dry, and its

immense territory is now in the hands of Europeans. Some Mahometan nations have attained unto a high degree of social and scientific culture. In the 12th century the Arabs of Spain were, in many respects, the masters of the savants of our countries. To-day, in the academies of Europe, memoirs are read on the causes of the decadence of Mahometan civilisation. The fact is not discussed, they only seek to explain it.[1] In order to obtain impartial views on this subject, it is necessary to disengage ourselves from present preoccupations resulting from the war in the East. I have therefore been careful not to draw my information from documents anterior to the struggle between the Russians and the Turks. I have consulted, for example, some memoirs of M. Blanqui, published in 1842,[2] on the social condition of the populations of Turkey in Europe, and I have appealed to the recollections of European diplomatists who have lived in Persia. In Persia, as in Turkey, civilisation is falling into decay, and the population is diminishing very sensibly. Polygamy has *mortal* consequences, in the literal sense of the word. Study facts, consult books, interrogate travellers; you will have no trouble in distinguishing, on the soil of humanity, the trees which are withering, and that which is constantly spreading out its branches. No one will seriously dispute the superiority of European civilisation; and

[1] See *Séances et travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales e politiques* (Institut de France), Feb. 1877.

[2] *Ibid.*

it is Christianity which gives to that civilisation the unparalleled power which it has manifested for its establishment, for its maintenance, and which it manifests to-day for its extension. It is this power of contemporary expansion which will now form the subject of our study.

All religious faith engenders proselytism. There is no religion which has not had in some degree the missionary spirit; but in this respect the differences are notable. The religion of Buddha, after making vast conquests, became stationary. I read, indeed, in a newspaper a few years ago that the Emperor of the Birmans had made known to Professor Max Müller, of Oxford, that he was going to publish in English the sacred books of Buddhism, 'in the hope of spreading, in Europe and in America, the knowledge of his religion, which he regards as superior to Christianity.'[1] More recently there has been some talk of missionary attempts made by pious Brahmins; but until we possess new facts, nothing warrants us in admitting that the religions of India and of China are preparing to march to the conquest of the world. The Mahometan faith has more vitality. The votaries of the Koran have made with the sword a terrible and victorious propaganda; but the days of their great triumphs are no more. Attention has been called to a present work of propagandism in Africa; but that is, in every case, a local phenomenon. Livingstone declared that in the part of the continent which he

[1] *Journal Évangélique du Canton de Vaud*, Oct. 29, 1871.

had explored he had met with only too many Arabs engaged in negro-hunting, but that he could not find any trace of a religious influence exercised by them on the heathen.[1]

The missionary spirit is one of the salient features in the character of the Christian faith, and manifests itself in all the Churches. Rome, for some years, has taken up with renewed ardour her work of propagandism, so brilliant in the 17th century; and her efforts seem to be principally directed towards India and China. All the Protestant Churches have entered into the path so gloriously and so sacredly opened up by the Moravian Brethren, and are now emulating each other's zeal for the conversion of the heathen. The Orthodox Eastern Church, so little known, and so often misknown among us, maintains missionaries in the Aleutian Islands,[2] in the Altaian Mountains, and doubtless elsewhere. I possess few particulars on this subject; here is one, however. In 1839 a wealthy merchant of Moscow, of the name of Malkoff, a widower, lost his only child. He realized his fortune, started for the valleys of the Altaï, established himself in the midst of idolatrous populations, and consecrated his time, his fortune, and his life to the evangelization and civilisation of these poor people.[3]

[1] For information on Mussulman missions see the articles published by M. Glardon in the *Bibliothèque Universelle*, Jan., Feb., and March 1877.

[2] See *Revue Chrétienne*, Sept. and Oct. 1877.

[3] *Missions dans les Altaï*, a paper, without date, printed at Paris, by A. Garéinoff. I knew the writer of this too brief account.

The work of contemporary missions encounters the same difficulties from without and from within as those which opposed the establishment of the gospel. These are, in the first place, the resistances which the human heart opposes everywhere to the conversion required by Christian morality; then, the attachment to the habits and to the memories of ancestors; lastly, the attraction of religions which too often favour evil passions. Another difficulty of the first order is met with in the conduct of nominal Christians, whom commerce, the searching after gold, and the desire of conquest, have led into idolatrous nations. The history of the conquest of Mexico and of Peru is frightful. That which nearly equals, on a lesser scale, the horrors of these abominable histories, is the record of the events which marked the establishment of Europeans at the Cape of Good Hope. On reading these melancholy pages, one asks one's self what idea the heathen could form of the so-called Christian nations, and one is obliged to answer that for them a Christian must have appeared in the light of a greedy and ferocious spoliator. I leave this dark past, and come to more modern times.

The actual work of missions is hindered by sailors who give themselves up to nameless debaucheries in heathen lands, and who, when these people desire a moral reform, do their very best to oppose it. It is hindered by merchants who shamefully deceive the poor savages, and who, as far as possible, oppose themselves to their enlightenment and civilisation, because

instruction renders them less easy to be duped. Then comes the brandy trade, which introduces the death-principle into tribes who were quite ignorant of its effects. Listen to the plaint of a North American Indian chief, who said to a European: 'Before your fathers came to live near us, we had no idea of these fire-waters. But some of your wicked brothers brought us this poison, and see what the consequences have been! We are now reduced to a handful of men to weep over the tombs of our ancestors.' [1]

This language is noble, touching, and the facts which give rise to it are fearfully sad. The poor Indians are not even permitted to weep over the tombs of their fathers; their territories are taken from them, sometimes by craft, sometimes by force. 'They have been driven from place to place. . . . When they had established themselves on lands assigned to them by treaty, and when they had begun to maintain themselves by their toil, they were rudely expelled and thrown back again into the savage wilds. Many of the Indian wars, if not all, had their origin in the violated promises and in the unjust acts of the inhabitants of the United States.'

It is not I, gentlemen, who pronounce this severe judgment. I have just read to you an extract from the message of a President of the United States, bearing date Dec. 3, 1877. Nor was this all; after expulsion came the work of extermination.

It has often been said that the inferior races of

[1] Poulain, *L'œuvre des missions évangéliques*, p. 39, Geneva 1867.

mankind disappear by the effect of a fatal law. There is some truth in this assertion; I shall refer to this in my next lecture. But do you know how the working of this formidable law is being accelerated? Listen! Last year, in 1876, there died a woman who was the last representative of an entire race—the Tasmanians of Van Diemen's Land. In 1803 the English established a convict settlement in that island. From 1803 to 1810, a period of seven years, no penalty had been fixed for the murder of a native. How was this silence of the law turned to profit? The European settlers made an agreement whereby they gave £5 for the head of each adult native, and £2 for the head of each child. Some of the men thus hunted like wild beasts made war against the English. Could it have been otherwise? If I am not mistaken, they were twice transported wholesale, and at length they disappeared from the face of the earth. The details of these abominations are not found in the writings of men who might be suspected of partiality, but in a scientific monograph, written by an author who quotes witnesses for every fact that he advances.[1] Such, in regard to the nations that need to be converted to the gospel, are the acts and deeds of people called Christians. And what have the Governments done? When the scandal was very notorious, the Governments interposed in favour of humanity. But, on the other hand, the cannons of France have imposed strong drink upon the Polynesians, and England has com-

[1] Dr. Gerland, *Ueber das Aussterben der Naturvolker.*

pelled the Chinese to receive opium, that poison which is stupefying and destroying them.[1]

After that, what the governments do is to appropriate the territories from which they have expelled the primitive inhabitants. That is how Europe presents itself in the eyes of the heathen. Do you now understand the mountains of prejudice which confront the bearers of the gospel? Do you understand why Williams, the missionary to the South Sea Islands, when the approach of a European ship was announced, betook himself to prayer, as at the approach of the greatest of dangers?

I have told you what the heathen too often behold when Europeans visit them. What do they see when they visit Europe? The relations between the various populations of the globe have been marvellously multiplied. There are found now in London large numbers of Hindoos, of Chinese, of Africans. Max Müller has related the profound discouragement of a converted Hindoo, who, after reading the New Testament, had pictured to himself what a Christian land should be, and who, during a tour in Europe, found everything very different from what he had imagined

[1] M. Chriestlieb, professor of the University of Berlin, has published a study on the opium traffic. He calls attention to the fearful extension of this trade from year to year, the incalculable evils resulting from it, and the obstacles which the English Government in this matter puts in the way of missions. He relates the following sadly significant fact: Some Protestant missionaries were expelled from one of the cities of the empire by the populace, who cried, 'You poison that you may destroy us, and then you come to teach us virtue.'

in his solitary meditations in Benares.[1] His faith came out of the trial victorious, because he succeeded in distinguishing the Christian religion from its adulterations, and from the conduct of its unworthy representatives; but the trial was a very severe one. Some Greenlanders who have been converted to Christianity are at this moment in Paris. A short time since they received a visit from some of the savants of the capital. I remarked, alas! among their visitors' names that of a representative of the most complete Materialism. The Shah of Persia travelled over Europe in 1873. What idea was he able to carry away of our civilisation? I know not what he may have seen of its shameful and hidden sides, but he would doubtless remark, at the sight of our arsenals and of our armies, that the art of killing men is one of the principal preoccupations of Christians.

Permit me from these considerations to draw a practical consequence. For the greater part, gentlemen, we cannot go out as foreign missionaries; many among us are not able to support the work by their gifts; but we all have the means of helping on this great enterprise. We cannot carry the light afar, but we can labour to purify its centre. To reform abuses in our own country, and especially to reform ourselves, is to labour for the good of idolatrous nations; for all things are linked together in this world, and act upon each other. Let us not forget that the lack of Christianity in Christians is one of

[1] *Essays on the History of Religions*, p. 30.

the greatest obstacles which the work of Christian missions has to encounter. Now, to some extent, each one of us may labour to remove this obstacle.

I have reviewed the difficulties which come from without; let us glance at those which proceed from the missions themselves. Missionaries are men; they have the same infirmities and the same failings as ourselves. Some of them are full of a zeal which never flags; but their zeal is not always accompanied with a desirable knowledge; it is more eager than judicious. Others lack perseverance. Livingstone complains of a superintendent of English missions in Central Africa, who found it convenient to reside in a town at the seaside, where he might enjoy the sweets of civilisation. He complains, not without a certain bitterness, of 'those gentlemen who play at being missionaries, and who content themselves with observing their diocese through a telescope.'[1] Missionaries have the habits and the ideas of their respective nationalities. Sometimes they are tempted to impose, in the name of religion, customs which are not the necessary consequence of evangelical faith. Do they belong to a powerful nation—to France, to England, to the United States? Patriotism may lead them, unconsciously, to seek, not solely the extension of the kingdom of God, but also the political influence of their country.

Lastly, and especially, let us note the deplorable

[1] Letter written to Mr. James Gordon Bennett. See the *Revue Scientifique*, of April 25, 1874, p. 1011.

conflicts between the representatives of the various religions. Picture to yourselves heathen who have raised a little the thick veil of their superstitions, who are beginning to form themselves into Christian communities, and who see arrive missionaries who tell them that they have been wrongly instructed, and who try to persuade them that they, the new-comers, bring them the only sound doctrine. What perplexity in the minds of these poor people! Their thoughts remain in suspense, and Christ is in danger of being forgotten. These conflicts do not exist only between Catholics and Protestants; unexceptionable witnesses tell us that sometimes the agents of the Church of England enter rather as enemies than as allies into the labour-field of Protestant communities.[1]

That portion of the world which still remains to be converted is immense, and there is in it room for all the workers; but it seems sometimes that the missionaries of the various Churches track each other, as it were, to mar each other's work. One might compare them to hungry individuals entering into an

[1] This fact was pointed out in an article on 'Evangelical Missions in the 19th century,' in a Neuchâtel newspaper, Aug. 1877. Long before that, on the 9th of April 1872, Livingstone was grieved by thinking of those men 'who appropriate, so to speak, the labours of their predecessors, when there are within their reach millions of heathen to evangelize.' 'Missionaries, and especially missionary bishops, ought, no matter who they be, to be well-bred men. Now, does it not seem a little strange to see these "dear brethren" establish themselves in the midst of a flock which a neighbour has gathered, at a cost of fifty years' toil and devotion, and become guilty of conduct which looks very much like the sheep-stealing for which they so much reproach these savages?'—*Revue Scientifique* of April 25, 1874, p. 1012.

orchard, where they all might find fruit in abundance, but all rush to the same trees to wrangle over them. In our age of international congresses and conventions, would it not be possible to form a convention of the missionary Churches and societies, which would engage, for a century or two, not to enter into the labours of others, and which would divide among themselves the countries into which no minister of Christ has yet penetrated? At the end of the convention it would be time enough to seek to perfect, according to the views of each, the work accomplished. It seems to me that this idea ought to be agreeable to all, except to those Catholics who believe that it is better to be a heathen, and to eat human flesh, than to become a Protestant; and to those Protestants who think that it is better to be an idolater, and to sacrifice human victims, than to become Catholics.[1]

In the midst of such manifold opposition from without, and of so many miseries within, the work of evangelizing the heathen is progressing nevertheless; it bears the fruits of conversion and civilisation. In order to form a judgment on this point, it is essential to get at impartial sources of information. The reports of missionaries and of missionary societies may be

[1] Augustine Cochin, having heard, through J. L. Michelis, of the work of the Protestant missionaries in Labrador, brought it before the notice of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences (*Séances et travaux*, Sept. 1867). He did more. When he met with some Catholic missionaries of North America, as he sometimes did, he exhorted them to accord to the Moravian missionaries their esteem and confidence. Men animated by such a spirit are unhappily rare in all the Churches.

challenged, or at least be thought to stand in need of examination, seeing that these are prepossessed in favour of their work. In the same way we ought to challenge the accounts of men notoriously hostile to Christianity. And what shall we say of the complaints of those sailors who are discontented at the opposition raised to their debaucheries by converted savages, or of those merchants who are irritated at not being able any more to dupe so easily the populations which have become better informed? We will say that these are valuable testimonies rendered to a good work, which these men glorify by calumniating it. Happily there remains to us sources truly impartial from which we may gather an opinion—accounts of travellers worthy of confidence, diplomatic documents, testimonies of savants who casually come across the work of missions. We have a double guarantee of impartiality, when, as is sometimes the case, by a stroke of good luck, we lay our hand on appreciations of Catholic missions by Protestants, and of Protestant missions by Catholics. *Apropos* of this, allow me to express to you a desire, the realization of which would result in the enrichment of our libraries, which contain so many useless books, by a book of the first order. This book would contain the testimonies of which I have spoken, on the great work of missions. The author would collect these testimonies, on the work of all the Churches, with the utmost impartiality. He would set them forth in an ordinary narrative style, avoiding the oft frequent repetition of pious

sentiments, which is natural to men whose life is devoted to the work of evangelization, but which would appear excessive to ordinary readers. He would clearly state the effects of the preaching of the gospel on civilisation, as well as its specially religious effects. The years devoted to this work would be time well employed. I will point out one more way of augmenting the sources of information. Nowadays, when there are so many facilities for travelling, many young men belonging to our wealthy families devote months, and sometimes years, to voyages to distant lands, which often have no other result than that of procuring for them some distractions, and of lightening their purses for the benefit of hotel-keepers and of railway and steamboat companies. If some of these young men would go and visit the various mission stations, independently of missionary societies, travelling at their own expense, they might bring back with them valuable documents for the book I have in view.

With our present stock of documents, what may we affirm as to the results obtained? As to conversions, in the true and profound sense of the word, God alone knows their number; but what we can state is the number of heathens who have been baptized, and whose names are upon the register of Churches. Now, these are reckoned by hundreds of thousands. In our countries of national religions, the official registers have a well-known value; it is precisely equal to zero. It is not thus with the Churches that are being formed

among the heathen. In order to receive the gospel message, it is always necessary there to break with traditions and habits, often to brave persecution, and sometimes torture and death. The Christian martyr does not belong solely to history. In modern times the soil of Japan, of China, of Madagascar, has been largely watered with the blood of the confessors of the faith. In these conditions, entrance and continuance in the Church proves something. What proves still more is the fact that these pagan converts take an active part in the work of evangelization. They add their gifts to those of the European and American societies, and many among themselves become missionaries. The existence of these native missionaries is a fact of great importance, and, in its generality, it is a novel fact. It is easy to understand its importance as a means of proselytizing. Many precious lives are saved, because the work may be pursued without danger by natives in those countries whose climate is fatal to Europeans.[1]

Conversions properly so called are only a part of the work of missions. The preaching of the gospel acts on public morals, and has a direct influence upon souls within the circle of its social radiations. Cannibalism, human sacrifices, the general practice of infanticide and polygamy, are seen rapidly to disappear. The vices which offer the most stubborn resistance are drunkenness and impurity. Are we in

[1] See M. Garcin de Tassy's report on *La langue et la littérature Hindoustanies en* 1870.

a favourable position to cast stones at the savages with respect to this? But time presses; I must limit myself to the gleaning of a few facts in the margin of the ideal book of which I have spoken.

In 1823, Captain (afterwards Admiral) Duperré presented to the French Minister of Marine a report on the Archipelagoes of Polynesia, and especially on the island of Tahiti. He was well acquainted with the past history of that blood-stained island, where the ovens used for cooking human bodies were never extinguished; and he pointed out the wonderful change effected by the labours of the agents of the London Missionary Society, who had succeeded in making out of this ferocious horde a people mild and civilised. The minister, M. Hyde de Neuville, had already been informed by other naval officers of the marvellous results obtained in Oceania. He caused Captain Duperré's report to be inserted in the *Moniteur*, adding to it his own reflections on the civilising power of the Christian religion. This number of the *Moniteur* fell into the hands of the astronomer Laplace, who, as is well known, was devoid of all religious convictions. He was profoundly impressed after reading Duperré's report. As he promenaded in the garden of the observatory with one of his friends, he said to him, 'Do you know Christianity is an excellent thing? Have you read in the *Moniteur* Captain Duperré's report on the changes introduced in Tahiti by the missionaries? The Christian religion is truly the only one which is able to produce a real civilisation,

and to render men capable of walking in the paths of good morals, of light, and of liberty.'[1]

That is a first fact; here is a second. You know the name of Darwin, the author of a natural history hypothesis, from which endeavours are being made to draw irreligious consequences that it does not warrant.[2] Darwin made a voyage round the world, of which he published an account.[3] He mentions the labours of the missionaries, especially in Tahiti and New Zealand. He testifies (and he is a very impartial witness) that under the influence of the Christian religion the populations of these islands have reached a degree of morality comparatively satisfactory. He says that he had been led astray by the enemies of missions, who had affirmed that the Christian religion makes these savages morose and sad, whereas he found them gay and happy. And, finally, he shoots a sufficiently sharp arrow at these calumniators by observing that, should they happen to be shipwrecked on those shores, formerly so inhospitable, they would be glad to find to-day people on whom the gospel has exerted its influence.

In 1847 an English ship, the *Graham*, driven far out of its course, was brought by the hurricane within

[1] The friend to whom Laplace thus spoke was Baron M——. I have seen the correspondence, in which there is given an account of the relations between him and the celebrated astronomer, and which was mentioned by Poulain in *L'œuvre des missions évangéliques*, pp. 276–278.

[2] On this subject may be consulted *The Heavenly Father*, Lect. iv., near the end.

[3] *Voyage of a Naturalist Round the World*, 1831–1836.

sight of unknown, icy shores. The captain, by means of his chart, recognised them for the coasts of Labrador. His men were in want of everything—food, fuel, warm clothing; the ship was dismasted and without sails. Through the telescope the habitations of the people were visible; but they dared not fire the minute gun. Better suffer everything than fall into the hands of the greedy and ferocious Esquimaux. However, a few *kajaks* left the shore, and by the help of their oars were approaching the vessel. The sailors seized their weapons; but from all the *kajaks* came signals of peace. The *Graham* was piloted into a sheltered creek; Christian hospitality was lavished on the passengers, and soon the Moravian missionaries who pastorated this little community arrived to bid them welcome. On his arrival in England the captain of the *Graham* published this touching episode. The principal newspapers reproduced it.[1]

One more fact, and I have done my gleaning. A Frenchman, M. de Varigny, lived fourteen years in the Sandwich Islands. He there became Minister of State, and his official position placed at his disposal all necessary means of information. He published the result of his observations, in a valuable volume which appeared three years ago.[2] In it are found the following statements. The inhabitants of these islands

[1] *Deux lettres sur les missions chez les païens*, by J. L. Micheli, p. 20, Geneva 1860.

[2] *Quatorze ans aux îles Sandwich*, by C. de Varigny, Paris, Hachette, 1874.

formerly presented all the characteristics of the most degraded populations, except, perhaps, cannibalism. Slavery, polygamy, human sacrifices, the most absolute despotism, incessant wars, superstitions, ferocious or ridiculous, none of these were wanting. To-day the Hawaïan archipelago forms a constitutional monarchy. Parliamentary government has been established on a solid basis. In the parliament at Honolulu speeches are made which equal those of many European orators. This little people maintains its independence in face of the eager desires of the United States. Public education is flourishing; there is perfect religious liberty; beneficence is exercised even towards distant foreigners. In 1870 these ex-savages heard of the misfortunes of France; they opened a subscription in behalf of those who suffered from the war, and although neither numerous nor wealthy, they collected above £400.

This unheard-of transformation was the work of fifty years. In 1820 the first missionaries arrived in the Sandwich Islands; in 1870 the entire people kept a solemn jubilee to celebrate the semi-centenary of their civilisation. And yet none of the obstacles which oppose themselves to the action of the gospel were wanting. The evil passions of the human heart, long habituation to vice, the traditional attachment to their ancestral idolatries, the mistaken measures of a converted queen, who wished to impose her faith upon her people, naval officers of the United States and of France employing threats in order to maintain

the practice of debauchery and the introduction of spirituous liquors, the conflicts of the representatives of three churches, Protestants, Catholics, and Episcopalians,—all this has been surmounted, and in fifty years—a very short space in the life of a people—Christianity has manifested its power of social transformation in so striking a way, that it would require a spirit very frivolous indeed not to accord the most serious attention to a fact of this kind.

No one, I suppose, will accuse me of concealing the defects of the work of missions. Yet, notwithstanding these defects, that work deserves the sympathies and the support of all the friends of mankind. From the standpoint of faith it imposes itself as a religious duty upon all believers. Nor is that all. The abominations committed by Europeans in their relations with the heathen call for reparation. The civilisation of these nations (and the gospel alone civilises them) imposes itself as a duty of honour upon all the inhabitants of Europe and of the United States of America.

It was about eighteen centuries ago that Jesus said to His disciples, 'Go and teach all nations.' Open a map of the world, mark on it all the missionary stations, and you will see that Christ has now His soldiers on all the points of the globe. No difficulty stops them. They go to the tropics, where the heat smites them down; they go to the ice-bound shores of Greenland, where the cold kills them. They die, and others replace them. In the work of exploration,

the curiosity of geographers has done much, the love of science more, the love of money more still. The command of Christ has done and is still doing most of all. It has done more than curiosity, more than the love of knowledge, more than the thirst for gold, more than the greedy passions of slave-hunters. Missionaries are reckoned by thousands. What an army! It braves all climates, it exposes itself to all kinds of perils; in the war which it wages only its own blood is shed. And the Commander? In the language of men, He is dead; in the language of truth, He is the ever-living. This idea appears to have made a deep impression on the mind of Bonaparte. When he had ceased to shake the world, when the tumult of his battles and the rolling of his drums had given place to meditation on the rock of St. Helena, he cast a melancholy glance upon his career, and, by a natural association of ideas, he thought of Cæsar, of Alexander, of Louis XIV., then of Christ, and a striking contrast presented itself to his mind. To the glory courted by the great ones of the earth he saw succeed the helplessness and destitution of misfortune, then the silence of death. 'Such is the approaching destiny of Napoleon the Great. . . . What a gulf between my deep misery and the reign of Christ—preached, reverenced, beloved, adored—*living throughout the universe!* Is that to die? Is it not rather to live? . . . Christ speaks, and henceforth the generations are His.'[1]

[1] Beauterne, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*, 6th ed., pp. 109–111, Poissy 1845. I am aware that the historical value of the

The world is full of miseries, of scandals, and of crimes; but it tends to organize itself into harmony and unity; this is the characteristic of civilisation, of progress. But do not imagine that the law of progress is like physical laws, which are always realized, and which need nothing but time to attain unto the fulness of their effects. If it were thus, if the progress of human populations were necessary, there would no longer be any savages and barbarians on the surface of the globe. Progress is a moral law, proposed to the liberty of man. Social progress has conditions, and when those conditions are not fulfilled, civilisation recedes. But it manifestly advances if we look at things on a wide scale, and from a general point of view. Now, what is the principal source of progress, the origin of the current into which, like so many affluents, all the good results of the work of the reason, of the heart, and of the conscience of man, have been poured? That source is found in Judea, at the foot of the hill of Nazareth. In the order of thought, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, and Leibnitz are great names. Among the legislators, Lycurgus, Solon, Charlemagne are great names. In the order of power, Alexander, Cæsar, Bonaparte are great names. But a greater name than that of all these illustrious personages is that of Jesus. The Apostle Paul said that

documents by the help of which this book was composed has been disputed; but, authentic or not, the words are likely words for Napoleon to use, and, in any case, the sentiment they express is warranted by the facts.

He had received 'a name which is above every name' (Phil. ii. 9). Of whom spake he thus? Of One that had been crucified, of One Who was the object of the hatred of the Jews and of the raillery of the Greeks. The affirmation was a bold one, and could only have proceeded from a firm belief. Well, gentlemen, what was for Paul a matter of faith, has become for us a matter of experience. When the Roman Empire was in all the glory of its power, a young artisan, of a despised province, left his native village to announce in the neighbouring villages a doctrine which He called the gospel. A few of the common people joined Him, and after giving them His instructions, He said to them, 'Go and teach all nations.' Seeing men scattered and divided, He announced Himself as the universal Shepherd. He founded a religion which even those who do not believe in it, nevertheless, if they are serious, consider as the best of religions. He founded a civilisation which is becoming that of mankind. The Carpenter of Nazareth, become the Crucified of Golgotha, has done more than any of the sons of men for the progress of the world in unity and harmony, in dignity, justice, and beneficence. Whence did He obtain this extraordinary power? what was He? That is the question I proposed at the commencement of these lectures, 'What must be thought of Christ?' We have collected the elements of the answer; it remains for us to conclude.

SEVENTH LECTURE.

Conclusion.

GENTLEMEN, — I have broadly sketched, in a picture of which it is not necessary for me to point out the imperfections, the work that Christ has accomplished in the world. I have done this in keeping as much as possible outside of everything that scientific criticism may dispute. I have equally left on one side all the researches of speculative thought which constitute dogmatic theology. I have taken for task to make you appreciate the tree by showing you its fruits.

Having enumerated and stated the facts, it remains for us to seek the best explanation of them; but it is of great importance that we understand each other as to the bearing of that explanation. Will it have for result a faith properly so called, that is to say, the state of a soul which gives itself to Jesus Christ as to its Master and Saviour? No. A faith properly so called cannot be simply the conclusion of a process of reasoning, because faith is an act of confidence which results from the functions of a soul in their whole, and not solely from the exercise of thought. What

leads to Jesus as the Comforter is not so much lectures as the experience of life, of its sorrows, of its deceptions, and of the impotence of human aid. It is for a soul thus prepared that the invitation, 'Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden,' possesses all its value. What leads to Christ the Redeemer is the serious awaking of the conscience, and the need of pardon arising out of the sense of our moral misery; it is the distinct view of the law in its august purity and of our own faults. It is therefore the conscience and the will which intervene more than the intellect. Jesus Himself gave a rule for the demonstration of His doctrine, when He said, 'If any man *will* do His will, he shall know of My doctrine, whether it be of God or of men' (John vii. 17). It is to the will that He appeals in order to lead the intellect to the truth. Let it then be well understood that, for the religious development of the soul, a passion subdued, an act of devotion, a sacrifice made to duty, is more important than all arguments. I do not wish to depreciate a work which to me has been salutary, a fact which leads me to hope that it may be salutary to some of you also; but it was expedient to clearly point out the nature of my teaching, and to indicate the limits of its action.

And, now, what is the best explanation of the facts that we have reviewed? In order to understand the question thoroughly, let us not forget that the advent of Christianity is not an isolated phenomenon. The religion of Jesus strikes its roots into the past, and

spreads its branches into the future. Israel prepares the Church. And not only does the work of the gospel connect itself directly with Israel, but it is linked with the general history of mankind. Alexander and Cæsar prepare it by realizing the unity of the Roman Empire, which was to facilitate the propagation of the new doctrine; Socrates and Plato prepare it by directing the thought into higher regions; the Stoics prepare it by laying stress upon the value of the soul, and by generalizing the idea of humanity. Christianity takes up into its current all the pure elements of the past in order to make the future. To appreciate the work of Christ, it will not suffice to study what took place eighteen centuries ago; it will be necessary to study what has taken place *during* these 1800 years, and what is still taking place to-day. 'What proves the truth of the gospel?' demanded Dante Alighieri; and he replied, 'The works it has accomplished.'[1] That is what is too often forgotten by the men who are specially devoted to theological studies. They concentrate their attention upon texts, which are subject to all the discussions of criticism; and the dust raised by the debates of science hides from them the broad and clear beams of light which run through history.

The problem relating to the sources of the work of Christ may receive two solutions: the naturalistic and the Christian solution. The partisans of the natural-

[1] 'La prova che il ver mi dischiude
Son l'opere seguite.'—*Paradiso*, ch. xxiv.

istic solution affirm that Christianity is a simple product of human nature, and that its appearance in the world has been brought about by the ordinary laws of history ascertained by experience. The partisans of the Christian solution recognise in Christ and in His work a special intervention on the part of God. They admit that the clemency which pardons has intervened in the order of that justice which wills that all evil shall give rise to suffering and death. Just one word, in passing, on an objection which is often made to this kind of thinking. I refer to the assertion that an intervention of God in the world is not admissible, because the world is the work of an infinitely wise Creator, and that a good workman does not need to correct his work. I am always astonished when I meet this objection coming from the pen of serious writers. A good workman does not correct his work! But, according to the faith of Christians, God has interposed to arrest the natural effects of sin in the order of justice. Now, sin is the work of the creature, not of the Creator. The idea of divine pardon corresponds to that of liberty which makes revolt possible. Nor should we ever forget this; and this is just what men do forget when they apply to the spiritual order a kind of reasoning which is only applicable to the physical order, in which liberty does not intervene.

With respect to the work of John the Baptist, Jesus asked, 'Was it from heaven or of men?' (Matt. xxi. 23–25). It is also the question that we ask

with respect to the work of Jesus Himself, and this is *the question of faith.* The work of Christ has its antecedents in the past, and its consequences in the future; it is bound up with the entire history of humanity; but is it in itself and in its origin a special work of God—yes or no? If the answer be yes, we may inquire, in the first place, What was the mode of the union of God to humanity in the person of Christ? and then, What was the mode of this union in Christ's action on the world? This is *the question of dogmatics,* a question which, as I cannot too often repeat it, cannot be usefully and seriously approached until the question of faith has been affirmatively answered. Now, it is the question of faith which has been the sole object of my study. Let us examine the two solutions of the problem stated.

The naturalistic solution takes many forms. Among these there are two that I exclude from the discussion —the one because it outrages the conscience, the other because it does violence to history. This is the form that outrages the conscience: If one thinks that religion is an evil; if one thinks that, for the good of mankind, it is necessary to persuade it that everything is ruled by a fatal destiny, that justice will never be done, that the dead are lost without any hope of ever seeing them again,—I can understand, then, that a work which is deemed evil should be referred to an impure source. But such is not the position taken by a well-known writer in a *Life of Jesus* which made such a stir a few years ago. He recognises in Jesus

an unparalleled benefactor; he attributes to Him 'the highest consciousness of God that had ever been reached by mankind;' then, in order to explain His power, he assumes that He had recourse to lies and to charlatanry; and, in order to justify this conduct, he starts the theory that the common people can only be led by being deceived, and that those who deceive them must not be blamed, because every great work is thus wrought.[1] In that case I do not understand; or rather, I understand that what we are concerned with is not the work of Christ, but conscience and humanity; so that he who believes in conscience and respects humanity will be quite ready to say with Dante, 'Men do not discuss such doctrines; they look at them and pass on.'[2] Let us pass on, gentlemen!

The second form of the naturalistic solution that I eliminate from the discussion is that which openly violates history. A writer of the last century, a member of the *Institut de France*, Dupuis, affirmed, in a large book on *The Origin of all the Religions*, published in 1795, that 'Jesus Christ never existed, and that the fictitious personage to whom this name was given was only one of the numerous personifications of the sun.' Notions of this kind still glide into the shallows of literature, but no serious writer would venture to reproduce them. There are other explanations which, though not at first sight as absurd, yet

[1] Renan.

[2] 'Non ragioniam di lor, ma guarda e passa.'—*Inferno*, cant. iii.

really belong to the same category. Such are those which, without denying the existence of a Jew named Jesus, affirm that the influence of Christianity in the world does not proceed from Him; that the doctrine which bears His name comes really, some say from Greece, others from India, and yet others from the meeting and the mixing of Greek and Oriental ideas; so that Christianity does not come from Christ, but from opinions which have been accidentally attached to His name. To these fantastic interpretations of history, it suffices to oppose the testimony of Tacitus, who should be better informed as to the facts of his time than even the most ingenious critics of our day. Now what says he? 'The name Christian comes from Christ, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was given over to execution by the procurator Pontius Pilate. For an instant put down, this execrable superstition broke out afresh, not only in Judea, *where it had its source*, but in Rome itself, where all the infamies and horrors in the world flow together and find partisans.'[1]

Those are facts recorded by a man whom no one can suspect of intentions favourable to the Christian faith. How has it been possible so to violate history as to deny that Christianity sprang from Christ? Here is the explanation of this phenomenon. The Christian doctrine, such as it was established by Christ and His apostles, was submitted to the work of the human mind, which sought to extract from the received faith a science, a system of dogmatics. The

[1] *Annals*, bk. xv. chap. xliv.

Fathers of the Church, who undertook this task, had from the outset come under the influence of the genius of the Greek philosophers, and afterwards under that of the Alexandrine school, into which ideas of Oriental origin had penetrated. That took place after the new faith, come from Judea, according to the testimony of Tacitus and all the historians, had unfolded its power. But if the primitive documents of religion are not studied, if men only seek for Christianity, not in the writings of its first preachers, but in those of its secondary interpreters, they run the risk of taking for the original source the affluents which come to swell and often to trouble it. It is thus that, for example, Emile de Saisset came to see in the gospel nothing but a transformation of Platonism, because he had studied that gospel less in the writings of the New Testament than in the works of St. Augustine.[1] The dogmatics of St. Augustine were very largely influenced by the doctrine of Plato; but it was not from Plato that this Father of the Church borrowed the bases of a faith which on points of the highest importance flatly contradicts Platonism.

I take it as an established fact, that if the elements of Greek thought and the theories of Oriental thinkers had their part, too large sometimes, in the doctrines of

[1] See the French translation of the *City of God*, by E. Saisset, Introd. To M. Saisset's thesis that St. Augustine was a 'Christianizing Platonist,' I have opposed the thesis that he was a 'Platonizing Christian.' See the *Bibliothèque Universelle*, Nov. 1855. In the same review (July and August 1859) I studied the relations of the philosophy of Aristotle with the Christian doctrine.

the Fathers of the Church and of scholastics, the essentials of Christianity came from Christ. Let us now approach the serious form of the naturalistic solution. This is how it presents itself. Religion is an essential element of the human soul. It is developed and diversified under the influence of races and of climates, and under that of powerful personalities, such as Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster. Now the Semitic race, some say by instinct, others say by the effect of a development that is capable of explanation, was monotheistic, just as the Greeks were naturally polytheists, and the Hindoos pantheists. In this race there appeared an initiator of the first order, a man of elevated reason, of pure conscience, and of great heart, superior to Buddha, to Confucius, to Zoroaster—Jesus of Nazareth! He spread all over the world the monotheism which was the product of His race. The rational worth and moral purity of His doctrine assured its success. This doctrine attracted especially the poor and the little by the preaching of charity, while it conciliated thinkers by its conflict with idolatry. Once the new religion established, there was formed around its founder a 'miraculous legend,' as is the case with all great men; but in reality everything happened naturally. Christianity is the brightest flower borne by the tree of religion; but its origin is explained, like the origin of all other religions, by the ordinary laws of history. Such is the opinion of many of the savants in our day. It was already that of some of the contemporaries of St. Augustine, who

acknowledged the lofty wisdom of the man Jesus, but refused to admit the divinity of Christ.[1]

We are now in presence of a serious affirmation, and one which is calculated at first sight to seduce intellects fashioned by the current teaching of philosophy and of the sciences; but this affirmation raises grave and numerous difficulties. Was monotheism natural to the Hebrews? It is just the contrary that appears to be true. This people, as its own history shows us, was always inclined to idolatry; the voice of its legislators and of its prophets had to be raised incessantly to keep it from sliding down this declivity. Do the successes of Jesus' doctrine explain themselves by its harmony with the reason, the heart, and the conscience? It satisfies the reason, that is true; but it also has mysteries which confound it. It comforts the heart assuredly; but it also breaks it, when it demands that the affections, even the most natural and legitimate, shall be sacrificed to the cause of God and of duty. It no doubt calms the conscience by the assurance of pardon; but how it disturbs it by its exactions, when it teaches that, to the sacrifice of the Master on the cross, must respond the spiritual sacrifice of the disciple by the destruction of selfishness in the depths of his soul! In the doctrine of Jesus men do not meet one of the causes which could favour its

[1] Pagani qui Dominum ipsum Jesum Christum culpare aut blasphemare non audent, eique tribuunt excellentissimam sapientiam, sed tanquam homini. . . . Honorandum enim tanquam sapientissimum virum putant; colendum autem tanquam Deum negant.—Augustine, *De consensu Evangelistarum*, bk. i. chap. vii. § 11.

establishment to which there is not joined an obstacle of equal strength.

Consider now the exterior obstacles. Palestine was a country subjected to the Roman power, and by the Greeks called barbarous. In Palestine, Galilee, the home of Jesus, was a despised province. 'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' (John i. 46), asked the people. Jesus was merely an artisan. 'Is not this the carpenter? Is not this the carpenter's son?' ask they with wonder or contempt (Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiii. 55). He died an infamous death, after a ministry which does not appear to have lasted more than three years. His disciples were poor people: fishermen, a publican. Think of the superb contempt of Tacitus, the pitiless railleries of the philosopher Celsus, the haughty disdain of the Emperor Julian, for a rude doctrine, unworthy of the wisdom of Greeks; then think of the persecutions. Accumulate in your mind, as they have been in history, all the circumstances disfavourable to the propagation of a doctrine, and you will understand the import of the saying of John de Müller, the national historian of Switzerland, when he remarks that the gospel appeared 'in a fashion the least likely to be adopted.'[1]

There are many difficulties for the naturalistic solution. Considerations of this order led Professor Reuss of Strasbourg (who cannot be suspected of credulity) to say that, 'if the acts of Jesus had nothing in them which goes beyond everyday

[1] Letter to Charles Bonnet, cited in *La Vie Eternelle*, fifth lecture.

experience, His history would only be the more incomprehensible.'[1]

The difficulties of the naturalistic solution naturally throw back the mind upon the Christian solution. But that is only an indirect and negative proof. In order to admit a special intervention of God, something more is needed; men desire proofs positive and direct. The ancient apologies of the faith speak of miracles and prophecy. May I speak of them in the 19th century in the light of modern science? Can I speak of them without departing from my programme, which obliges me to keep outside of all the debates of criticism? Yes, gentlemen, I may speak of miracles and of prophecy, and I shall speak of them without going beyond my programme. I begin with prophecy.

For the sake of argument, I admit the doubts of the most negative criticism, provided it remains serious. These books are not authentic; these names of authors are incorrect; these dates are false; those prophecies were written after the events to which they point. I suppose all this to be admissible, and I ask: Do the Old Testament Scriptures affirm, not only in a few rare passages, but in a long series of texts, that the God of Israel will become the God of mankind, and that all nations will come to Him?[2] Do the writings

[1] *The Bible.* Synopsis of the first three Gospels, p. 109.

[2] As examples, see 1 Kings viii. 43, 60; Ps. cii. 23; Isa. ii. 2, xi. 9, 10, xlv. 22, xlix. 6, lvi. 7, lxvi. 18, 23; Jer. iii. 17; Micah iv. 1, 2; Hab. ii. 14; Zeph. iii. 8, 9; Zech. viii. 22, 23.

of the New Testament put into the mouth of Jesus words announcing that His doctrine will be preached in the whole world, that it will be offered to all, but that all will not receive it? that His work will be universal, but that it will be accomplished under difficulties, hindrances, and persecutions?[1] Have things come to pass, and are they still coming to pass, in this way? Is the religion of Christ marching onward to the conquest of the world, in the conditions indicated by its Founder? and, through the religion of Christ, is the God of Israel, the God of Abraham and of Moses, becoming the God of mankind? The facts are conformed to the texts of the Old and New Testaments. Can it be assumed that the Jews fabricated the Old Testament to serve the cause of Christianity, or that they allowed the Christians to introduce unauthentic passages into the book of which they were the guardians? The supposition will not bear discussion. And the declarations of the New Testament relative to the propagation of the gospel, were they inserted after the event? Discuss the dates; suppose all the alterations possible in the documents; it is no less certain that we have in our hands previsions contained in very ancient texts, and that we can prove the actual accomplishment of these previsions. So much for prophecy; pass we now to the miracles.

What is a miracle? Experience shows us in the phenomena of the world a determinate order, which science formulates into what we call laws. These

[1] See Matt. xiii.–xxviii. 18, 19; Mark xvi. 15; John x. 16, xii. 32.

laws established by science encounter exceptions. In proportion as study advances, these exceptions are referred to laws better known and better understood. But it is possible to meet exceptions such as the mind admits, in virtue of a possible supposition that they are the result of the intervention of a superior order to the habitual order of experience, the manifestation of an act of the first cause other than that which has regulated the ordinary course of events. The supposition is permitted, unless Atheism be held to be a certain truth. If the supposition is admitted to be true, the exception is called, in our language, *a miracle*, because it is a special sign of the power of God. The word *sign*, that we translate by the word *miracle*, is the term habitually employed by the writers of the New Testament to designate the superhuman works attributed to Jesus of Nazareth. We thus arrive at this definition of a miracle, which is that of the *Dictionary* of the French Academy, 'an act of Divine power contrary to the known laws of nature.' The *Dictionary* says with reason, 'contrary to the *known* laws of nature,' and not contrary to laws in the sense of a capricious and arbitrary power. And for the Christian, as a matter of fact, a miracle, a sign, is in no wise an arbitrary act, but the intervention of the order of mercy in the order of justice.[1]

Let us observe that what may be stated in the order of experience is the exception to known laws, and not

[1] For the development of this thought consult *La Vie Eternelle*, third lecture, at the beginning.

a miracle. We see the effects; we do not see the causes. A fact is established, but it cannot be established experimentally that this fact is a work of God. As a general rule, the dead do not return to life. Suppose that one doctor, two doctors, three doctors have stated for certain that, by the laws of their science, a man is dead. The corpse comes back to life! If these doctors are Atheists, do you suppose that they will admit that a miracle has taken place? Not at all! They will simply say, 'We were mistaken; the man was not dead.' Should they be obliged to avow that all the known signs of death existed, they would say, 'We do not know all the laws of nature; some things want rectifying in our physiological treatises.' I repeat it: one may state experimentally an exception to the known laws of nature, but not an act of God. The act of God is a cause which we cannot touch or see, which eludes the microscope and the scalpel. Nothing in the world will ever make a man who denies the existence of God admit a Divine work; that is quite evident.

Outside the influence of Atheism, the reason of cultured men demands very strong evidence to admit an exception to the known laws of nature, because the history of science informs them that, in general, the progress of research has furnished a natural explanation of facts which at first were regarded as exceptions and prodigies. The question is, whether the destinies of Christianity offer characteristics which warrant the idea of a Divine intervention. Dante deemed that if

the idea of the miraculous was eliminated, the destinies of Christianity would only be the more miraculous,[1] and I have already pointed out a similar remark of Professor Reuss.

Let us approach the study of this grave problem. I am going to point out to you three miracles, or, if you prefer it (I do not hold to the word), three signs which appear to me to justify the affirmation that the destinies of Christianity form a positive exception in the history of mankind.

The first of these signs is the mode of existence of the Christian faith. A new study has been started and is being developed in our days by the labours of learned and numerous savants—the study of comparative religions, which shall furnish the basis of a general science of religion. This science is far from being completed, so that it would be rash to speak in its name, and to affirm what its results will be. But every one indulges in natural previsions on this point, previsions which remain legitimate if they are not transformed into definite judgments. The adversaries of Christianity say that the more the general fact of religion becomes known, the more will the Christian faith lose the pre-eminent position accorded to it by its votaries. Such is not the opinion of Professor

[1] 'Se il mondo si rivolse al Christianesmo,
Diss'io, senza miracoli, quest'uno
E tal, che gli altri non sono il centesmo.'
—*Paradiso*, cant. xxiv.

Dante only reproduces here the thought of his master, St. Thomas Aquinas. See *Somme contre les Gentils*, bk. i. chap. vi.

Max Müller, who concluded a lecture on the Vedas, delivered at Leeds in March 1865, with these words: 'No one can know what Christianity really is as well as he who has examined with patience and impartiality the other religions of the world; no one can repeat with so much truth and sincerity this saying of St. Paul, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."'[1]

I believe, for my part, that the more the religions of the world will become known, the more the laws which preside over their formation shall be seriously established, the more will the exceptional character of Christianity become apparent, and the more will it become scientifically established. Here are some of the grounds of my prevision. There are three principal religions which divide the inhabitants of the world between them—that of Mahomet, that of Buddha, and that of Christ. Let us rapidly establish a comparison between them.

The religion of Mahomet has in it some good elements. It teaches the unity of God against all idolatry, and prescribes a morality which contains, in many respects, precepts which are excellent. This is why the preaching of Islamism has exercised a beneficent influence upon the populations of Northern Africa, by inducing them to cease from human sacrifices, and by bringing to these ferocious and degraded people a civilisation relatively good. Woe to him who would not rejoice at this! But—we have seen it, and it cannot be seriously contested—Mahometanism is a

[1] *Essays on the History of Religions*, p. 73.

detached branch of Christianity; hence its superiority to the pagan religions. This branch, detached from the trunk which had borne it, has become deeply corrupted; and the successes of the Mahometan faith are explained by its evil elements as much as by the part of good that it contains. It excites the pursuit of voluptuousness, which it promises as a reward in heaven, and from which it removes every barrier on earth. To the attraction of sensual delights it joins the use of force. The religious use of the sword is positively recommended in the Koran. In it we read these words: 'Kill the idolaters wheresoever ye shall find them; take them prisoners; besiege them, and lay wait for them in every convenient place; but if they shall repent, and observe the appointed times of prayer, and pay the legal alms, then dismiss them in peace.[1] . . . Fight against them who believe not in God, nor in the last day, and forbid not that which God and His apostle have forbidden, and profess not the true religion. Fight against them until they pay tribute with their own hands, and be reduced very low.[2] . . . When ye encounter unbelievers, strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter among them.'[3]

Charlemagne converted the Saxons by processes which the Koran praises; but the proselytism of the sword did not make its appearance with Christianity until the gospel had won its cause by preaching and by martyrdom, while the proselytism of the sword is seen from the very outset in the work of Mahomet.

[1] *Sura*, ix. 5. [2] *Ibid.* ix. 29. [3] *Ibid.* xlvii. 4.

Slavery and polygamy are two of the blackest blots in Mussulman civilisation. They meet in the person of those mutilated negroes who guard the doors of the harems. Polygamy is not a general practice. The proportion of the sexes would not permit it, seeing that the number of births of boys and girls is nearly equal. Besides, the maintenance of a harem is very costly, and can only be the privilege of the rich. The monopoly of numerous women by one man has frightful consequences for morals, into the details of which I may not enter, and which explain the fact of the depopulation of which I spoke in my last lecture. M. Auguste Choisy, a French engineer, who has lately travelled through Asia Minor, speaks of cemeteries crowded with comparatively recent tombs, in regions where there are now no inhabitants at all.[1] Persia presents an analogous spectacle.

Mahometanism offers a mixture of sensual and warlike passions, resting on a basis of reason and of relative morality. It has spread like the flames of a fire. After conquering Spain, where they offered the spectacle of a brilliant civilisation, the Arabs advanced into the heart of France, the Turks menaced Vienna. Christianity seemed to have encountered, in an unfaithful child sprung from her own bosom, a formidable rival; but the glory of the Koran is departed. The defeats of the Mussulmans upon the fields of battle were as nothing to the inward cancer that is eating out their civilisation. The time is coming when another Montes-

[1] Auguste Choisy, *L'Asie Mineure et les Turcs en* 1875.

quieu will be able to explain, by the ordinary laws of psychology and of history, the grandeur and the decadence of the Moslems.

Let us now pass on to the examination of Buddhism, an extraordinary religion, which is becoming better known, at least in its essential traits, and which merits the most serious attention. Six centuries before our era, a young Indian prince, a man of upright conscience and of great heart, was so much struck by the miseries of life that he resolved to leave all and devote himself to a work of religious propaganda.[1] He left his property, his hopes of power, his happy family-life, clothed himself in an austere garb, and taught a morality so pure, that of all moralities, that of the Greeks included, it comes nearest to the morality of the gospel. His work was immensely successful; his religion was rapidly established in India; later on, it suffered persecution, and, quitting its cradle, it established itself in the other countries of the East. If we may rely on statistics, this religion counts among its adherents to-day more than a third of the inhabitants of the globe. These facts are wonderful; but they may, I think, be explained by natural causes. Represent to yourselves the effect that would be produced by the determination of this young prince abandoning, by a voluntary and absolute devotion, all the advantages of the most brilliant position. The Buddha lived eighty years. In the land of caste he proclaimed the equality

[1] Details on this subject will be found in *La vie eternelle*, third lecture.

of all men, which gained for him the favour of the populace. At the same time he had for supporters in the higher classes of society princes to whom he was equal by birth, and who quite as promptly accepted his doctrine. Lastly, a sovereign of genius, named Açoka, who had conquered the greater part of India, accepted the new faith, and imposed it on his people. He was the Constantine of Buddhism ; but as far as I can form a judgment on a history imperfectly known, I believe that there exists between two facts very similar in appearance, the following radical difference : The Christian faith imposed itself upon Constantine, because it had made the conquest of his empire ; while Açoka imposed Buddhism upon populations accustomed passively to obey the orders of their sovereigns. This widespread religion has followed the laws of things human. It bears the impress of Eastern ideas, and although it passed from India into other countries, it has never quitted the part of the globe where it took its rise. It promptly burdened itself with superstitions, without manifesting, as Christianity has always done, a characteristic power of reform. It is the science of our savants, and not that of Oriental teachers, which is discovering, beneath a mass of odd and sometimes absurd legends, a better basis ; and when our scholars plunge into the primary sources of Buddhism, they discover, to their astonishment, beside a morality often admirable, a doctrine which appears to be without God and without a hope of immortality. Buddhism is visibly declining. In the 7th century of our era, it

was more flourishing in all respects than European Christianity, which is not saying much; from that time its vital force has diminished. Lastly, and this proceeds from the nature of its dogmas, it throws man into the ways of contemplation and asceticism, and not into those of activity. This is why it has placed the East in general, and China in particular, outside of every general movement of progress.

To Mahomet, armed with the sword and distributing his bribes of voluptuousness, and to Buddha, a prince of illustrious birth, prosecuting his work to an extreme old age, compare now this young Jew, sprung from the obscure classes of society, Who only exercised His ministry during three years, Who had no other relations with the powerful than that of being accused by the rulers of His people, and handed over to execution by a Roman governor. To the destinies of the Islam and of Buddhism compare those of this religion, which carries in its bosom an eternal principle of reform, and which, arising in the East, and afterwards carried into the West, is visibly marching to the conquest of this world. Let us dwell on this last trait: Christianity, by its character of universality, escapes the common law which rules the mode of existence of religions.

The Christian religion, like all the others, doubtless feels the influence of race, of climate, and modifies itself in its exterior manifestations. In the systematic development of its doctrines it feels the influence of powerful individual minds. St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, for example, have left a mark on

theological science which is not yet effaced; but the substratum, the substance of the faith, that which characterizes, by opposition to all the other religions, the doctrine and the work of the gospel, has the imprint of universality. Now, how can a universal element be explained by particular causes? If there exists a law in virtue of which each people has its religion, how does this law account for the appearance of a doctrine adapted to all peoples? The more prominently the law is established, the more conspicuous is the exception. Jesus said, 'I have done works which no other man has done' (John xiv. 24). We cannot, like the witnesses of His life, see the works to which He alluded in these words. But what we can affirm beyond the attacks of critical science is, that in founding the religion of mankind He wrought a work with which no other can be compared. The universality of that work naturally directs the mind towards the one supreme Almighty Cause. This consideration had struck Montesquieu when he wrote: 'The religion of heaven is not established in the same way as the religions of earth. Read the history of the Church, and you will see the prodigies of the Christian religion. Has it resolved to enter into a country, it knows how to open its gates; all the instruments are ready. Sometimes God is pleased to employ a few fishermen; sometimes He comes to apprehend an emperor on his throne, and makes him bend his head beneath the yoke of the gospel. Does the Christian religion hide itself in subterranean places? Wait a moment, and you

hear imperial majesty speak in its behalf. It crosses at its will, seas, rivers, and mountains; it is not earthly obstacles that can hinder it. Put repugnance into men's minds, it will know how to conquer these; establish customs, form usages, publish edicts, frame laws, it will triumph over climate, over the laws which result from climate, and over the legislators who made the laws.' [1]

Montesquieu penned these lines before the revival of the missionary spirit which characterizes our age, and which furnishes new and powerful arguments in support of his thesis.

The mode of existence of the Christian faith escapes all those natural explanations which account for the destinies of the other religions; such is the thought of which you have just heard the development. In this general fact I select a detail on which I specially call your attention: the actual fact of the expansive power of Christianity. This is the second of the signs which I want to point out to you.

There exists in mankind inferior races, whom we call savages, and who show themselves incapable of civilising themselves. Many savants have affirmed that these races are becoming extinct through the action of a law which nothing can withstand. I have told you what frightful means Europeans have used to activate the effect of that law. But the law exists; these races do decay and disappear when they are left to themselves. Not only has this law been proclaimed,

[1] *Défence de l'esprit des lois*, article '*Tolérance.*'

but the three following consequences have been drawn from it. The first is the justification of the introduction of spirituous liquors among tribes ignorant of the use of them. In 1820, Captain Ross, in giving an account of his expedition to the North Pole, expressed an opinion, general enough, on the destruction of the Esquimaux. He said: 'Their fate appears to be that of the Redskins—annihilation. But is not rum preferable to the sword of the Spaniards? Rum is quite as efficacious, and it *at least gives them* some pleasure. Savages must make way for civilisation. This is the law of the world, and all the lamentations, and all the efforts of a whimpering philanthropy, will be of no avail.'[1]

The second consequence that has been drawn from this law consists in justifying, in a general way, the extermination of savages. This time it is not an English sailor who is going to speak, but one of the editors of a French review, *La revue de l'instruction publique.* I quote from the number for March 1867: 'They complain of the brutalities of navigators towards the savages. Well, who could regret to see such specimens of humanity disappear? Let us beware of being the dupes of a false pity and of a puerile fraternity!' A few years previously, the 15th October 1860, a well-known writer had told the readers of the *Revue des deux mondes* that 'one cannot but wish an easy death to the savage races, those sad survivors of a world in its infancy,' and that one must

[1] J. L. Micheli, *Deux lettres sur les missions*, p. 19, Geneva 1860.

'leave these last sons of nature to extinguish themselves on their mother's bosom,' without interrupting 'for an hour their moonlight dances and their sweet intoxication.'

The third consequence drawn from that law is the affirmation that to civilise savages is an impossible enterprise, and that all efforts in that direction are simply but trouble lost. This has been said especially about the Papuans. This is what a resident in Melbourne wrote: 'We who are accustomed to see them crawling along our streets, barely covered with filthy rags, more like apes than men, and most often in a state of complete intoxication, we regard them as creatures utterly degraded, who have no longer anything in common with ourselves, and of whose civilisation it is impossible to think.'[1]

Well, gentlemen, the impossible has been accomplished. Some of these miserable Papuans, more like apes than men, now form villages where labour is honoured, the inhabitants properly clothed, decent in their morals, and where the children attend good schools; moreover, the population, which was rapidly decreasing, is now increasing very visibly. A few years ago these extraordinary facts were pointed out by the missionaries who had been instrumental in producing them. All illusion! it was said at first. But no; the information was correct, and has been fully confirmed. At the Vienna Exhibition the Papuans

[1] Reichel, *l'Évangile et la Civilisation*, p. 35, Neuchâtel 1873. See the same paper for the details which follow.

obtained a medal of honour for the preparation of arrowroot. What is much more significant still, the schools for black children on the Ramahyuk station have been classed by the Government inspectors among the highest in the colony.[1] To-day the political newspapers of Australia speak of these civilised Papuans, and tourists go to visit their villages. Such are the results obtained by the long and heroic patience of the Moravian Brethren. They hoped against hope, and at last they are reaping the fruit of their toil.

Analogous facts are produced among the North American Indians. The Cherokees, the Choctaws, are to-day Christian tribes, and the gospel has been to them a word of life, even in the temporal sense of the term. Not only has the mortality which was destroying them ceased, but the increase in the population follows a growing progression.[2]

The savage races destroy themselves when left to themselves; cannibalism and human sacrifices decimate them; debauchery enervates them; their sap is exhausted; contact with Europeans accelerates their destruction. Such is the law established by observation and formulated by science. Here is the exception: the preaching of the gospel has subdued the law of nature; and the gospel alone possesses this power, as the astronomer Laplace remarked. The Christian faith is the unique cause which elevates the most degraded specimens of humanity. What has been declared im-

[1] *Journal de l'unité des frères*, p. 179, 1876.

[2] I have obtained this information in the papers of January 1862.

possible has been, and is being, done. Let us not speak of miracles; let us not speak of the supernatural, if these words shock you, but acknowledge at least that these facts are the striking signs of an exceptional power. I pass on to the third sign that I recommend to your attention.

You know that the King of Prussia, Frederick II., has been described, with reason, by the poet Andrieux as 'a very bad Christian.'[1] He had a chaplain. When kings have an official religion they keep a chaplain, whatever may be their personal views. He took pleasure in inviting this chaplain to his table in order to embarrass the good man with captious questions. One day he said to him, 'Mr. Parson, I should very much like to have an unanswerable proof of the divinity of the Scriptures, but it must be plain and short—one single word, if possible.' The chaplain reflected for a moment, then said to the king that he thought he could satisfy him. 'But,' repeated the king, 'let the proof be short — one word.' 'Well, sire, that word is *Israel*.' It is said that the king became thoughtful, and did not reply.[2]

He had indeed something to be thoughtful about. Take a walk in the streets of Geneva, gentlemen. Certainly there is no lack of places of worship. Protestant churches, official and free, Roman Catholic chapels, and a cult called the Government Catholic,

[1] *Le meunier sans-souci.*

[2] Otto Stockmayer, *Conférences sur la prophétie*, p. 41, after Bettex, *le Siècle présent et le Siècle à venir.*

a church of the Eastern Orthodox faith, Anglican, Lutheran, American Episcopal, and other chapels. New ones are being constantly built. Churches spring up in our town like mushrooms in the woods. The formation of these divers branches, sprung from the common trunk of Christianity, may be explained by the ordinary laws of the history of religions; but stand in front of that Oriental building, around which are gathered the banks and exchanges of the town. Aristotle said that 'wonder is the mother of science.' If you can pass before a synagogue without being astonished, you utterly lack the quality that the Greek philosopher singled out as the root of the scientific spirit. Who observes to-day the laws of Lycurgus and of Solon? Who knows them except law students when they do their duty? Who observes the precepts of Roman law save in so far as they have passed into modern codes? As to the laws of Moses, they are read every Saturday in the whole world by assemblies of men, who profess to follow them as far as circumstances permit. Here is a people, dispersed centuries ago over all the earth, hated, despised, down-trodden, persecuted. And yet, as soon as it emerges from the lowest condition in which wicked laws held it, it shows itself so full of sap that its sons figure in the front rank, not only in finances, where they excel, but in literature, in art, in politics, so much so that their preponderance is becoming for many a source of anxiety. According to statistics I have by me, the proportion of Israelitish youths who attend the gym-

nasia in Prussia is six times greater than that of Christian youths.[1]

Where will you find anything, I do not say like this, but analogous to this? Will you compare with the people of Israel the bands of Bohemians or of Zingaris, formerly, it is said, escaped out of Hindustan, and now roving in the various countries of Europe? These are races without history, and having no other relations with civilisation than those they sustain with the police, whom they sadly trouble, and by whom they are watched. Verily, the analogy is feeble. A people conquered and dispersed may for a time preserve its nationality (the Poles are a living proof of this), but at length it melts into the civilisation which absorbs it, and disappears. This is the law of history. The maintenance of Israel, with its attachment to its customs, to its religion, to the traditions of its ancestors, is a manifest exception to this law. This is a permanent prodigy, of which familiarity alone veils the splendour. No one is astonished to meet Jews and to see synagogues, because they always have been seen. Now, the prodigy, the sign, the miracle, is precisely that they have always been seen for eighteen centuries. Do you not understand how the modern history of this strange nation points to Jerusalem and to the cross of Calvary? This guardian people of prophecy is in its way a witness of Jesus Christ.

The Jews have not become converted! But to

[1] These particulars were printed in a Neuchâtel review: *les Missions évangéliques au 19e siècle.*

what should they have been converted? I ask. To Christianity? How could they have recognised it beneath the blood and mire-covered mantle in which it has been enveloped in their eyes? How should they recognise disciples of Christ in those wicked and greedy men who have tortured and robbed them? How would they recognise the Christian civilisation in those impious laws which placed outside the law the remnants of Israel and of Judah? Thank God, the time of these iniquities is past. There were two things to be done with respect to the Jews. The first was to admit them to full social rights; this has been, or is being done. The second is to extend to them a brotherly hand in a society where they have regained the rights and dignity of men, and to say to them: 'Brethren, let us humble ourselves together at the foot of the cross set up by your ancestors. They have sacrificed the just; and we, what have we done? From the summit of His cross He besought the pardon of the Father for those who put Him to death; and we, unfaithful disciples, we have coveted your riches, we have despised, hated, and tormented you. Our crimes are equal. Let us humble ourselves together; then let us rise together in the love of the Crucified, Who of two peoples has made one, and take in our ranks the place of honour due to the elder members of the family, for "salvation cometh of the Jews"' (John iv. 22).

I have pointed out one prophecy and three miracles, or three signs, which appear to me to be beyond the

attacks of criticism. Learned criticism easily raises doubts on ancient texts and on events which belong to an ever-receding past; but most of the facts which have entered into our study have a different character; they are growing under our eyes, and belong to a present which is visibly preparing the future. Every reserve being made for the rights of a serious science, the best explanation of the incontestable facts connected with the Christian faith is, for those who believe in God, the divinity of Christ and of His work. Such is my conclusion, and this is all that can be expected from reasoning.[1]

I should have concluded here, did I not wish, in a few words, to disperse a cloud which obscures, perhaps, the thought of some here present.

The Christian faith is a thing of the past; has it not become old and incapable of responding to the demands of the modern spirit? The law of progress must be accomplished. The men of our time need something new. Yes, doubtless, we do need something new; for all life is a development, all development brings with it new things, and mankind desires to

[1] Balzac, the writer of the 17th century, in his book entitled *le Socrate chrétien*, has put in a clear light the exceptional character of the destinies of Christianity, the character which forms the essential basis of my argument. He wrote: 'I see nothing in the rise and progress of this doctrine that does not seem to me to be more than natural. The ignorant have persuaded the philosophers. Poor fishermen have been raised into teachers of kings and of nations, into professors of the science of heaven. They have caught in their nets orators and poets, jurists and mathematicians.' For the remainder of this passage, see the *Chrestomatie of Vinet*, pp. 35-38.

live. But what do those innovators propose who would fain break with the Christian tradition? What do they demand? In what is called the modern spirit, the new spirit, there are in reality two spirits, not only different, but contrary, followed by two classes of men perfectly distinct. The one class demand the emancipation of the flesh, of the passions, of selfishness; they savagely cry out against society, and clamour against God. We will not speak of them. The other class are men of good and noble spirit, full of generous aspirations. Study what they propose. They demand a more complete recognition of the rights of each, the increase of benevolence, the amelioration of suffering, the combating of ignorance, the substitution of right for might, of love for selfishness. Now, of all these things there is not one that is not contained in germ in Christianity. These honest innovators proclaim nothing, conceive nothing, foresee nothing on the horizon which is not found in Jesus Christ, the inexhaustible fountain where the human conscience renews its strength. They feed off the fruits of the tree they would cut down.

Here is the error, the condemnation of many Christians, the excuse of many of their adversaries. The obsolete elements of an incomplete civilisation are taken for the truth for ever old and for ever new. They believe, they are left to believe, they are made to believe that all Christian thought is contained in the now broken framework of Scholasticism, all Christian civilisation in the *débris* of the institutions of the

Middle Ages, all the Christian faith in the dross with which the errors of men have covered it, all Christian morality in the conduct of individuals and of peoples who dishonour by their life the religion they profess. No, no! the source of the living waters does not allow its streams to settle in stagnant marshes. The work of the gospel is not a building whose roof has been put on, and which has been left to crumble and to perish under the influence of time; it is a germ incessantly developing. Look not merely at the dead branches of the ever-living tree; look at the young shoots spreading out their foliage beneath the sunshine of eternal truth. Yes, we have need of something new; but what could you have more new than the conversion of souls and the progressive transformation of society by the word of Christ? What could you have more new than the organization of the human family into unity, harmony, love? Great progress has been made, but what progress there still remains to be realized! We have no gladiators now, but we have war and its abominations. We have no more slaves, but how many ameliorations there are yet to be introduced into the relations of the various classes of society! Men make set speeches about fraternity, but true fraternity is oftenest so far from our hearts!

You feel the need of progress; take care you do not stifle it. To be content with the world as it is, and with yourselves as you are, it would be necessary for you to destroy the noblest instincts of nature, and to

impoverish and mutilate your souls. Progress is the law of life; but in order to realize this law there is no need of impossible dreams and unknown theories. It is not truth that is wanting; it is we that are awanting to the truth. To do the truth, to realize the thought of Christ, this will always be a great novelty. In our incompletely Christian civilisation the faithful disciples of Christ who practise the faith they profess will always be conspicuous. Will you make the attempt? Be true Christians; endeavour to be complete Christians. Do not interfere in the strifes of passion, in the conflicts of interest and parties, save to represent, as far as in you lies, the right, the just, the true. You will be thought an inconvenient innovator, and perhaps a fool. But this will only be because many men who talk of progress and of novelty do not desire a novelty which humbles them and a progress which condemns them. March on, however, with firm step! In the measure in which you will realize the love of Christ you will be one of the grains of the salt of the earth, though it be the least; one of the rays, be it the faintest, of the eternal light. You will encounter great obstacles from without, greater still in the miseries of your own nature, but be not discouraged! Do not forget that the moral life is a combat, and that one of the great laws of the spiritual order is that we must reach success through defeat, and pass through humiliation to glory. Under the government of Providence, the world ends by following that which it begins by rejecting. The Greeks put Socrates to death, then

raised statues to his glory. By the hands of the Jews humanity nailed Jesus to the tree; then, at the call of a few fishermen and of a tentmaker, it relents and follows Him.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

SECOND LECTURE.

Question 1.

COULD you not furnish us with some supplementary explanations with respect to the relations of religion and of science? Some of your hearers do not seem to have understood your thought. Does not science rise out of its own proper laws? In attempting to make the influence of religion intervene in its development, do you not alter the facts, and run the risk of injuring the cause which you desire to serve? He who would prove too much, proves nothing.

Answer.

I have stated a fact, and proposed an explanation of it. The fact is this: Science and scientific industry are, in these days, the monopoly of Christian nations. The explanation which I consider the best is that which I have given.

Between religion and science there exists a false and a true relation. The false relation is that which theologians establish when they endeavour to resolve

scientific questions by texts taken from the Holy Scriptures, or by the decisions of ecclesiastical authorities. This false relation manifested itself very clearly in Galileo's trial. That famous trial is only one example among many others of the fetters that theologians have often wished to put upon the researches of the human mind. The true relation is established by the following considerations:—Men often affirm that science proceeds from the alone observation of phenomena; this is an absolute error. The observation of phenomena is the necessary basis of every serious theory, and the only legitimate control of all hypotheses; but observation states facts and does not explain them. In the search after explanations, the human mind is always placed under the influence of certain directing principles. This is a thesis of logic whose development can be found in the *Revue Philosophique*, published in Paris (July and Aug. 1876; April, Aug., and Sept. 1877). All the founders of modern science, without one single exception, and those of our contemporaries who merit the title of initiators, have been directed by the unity of the world, by the simplicity and by the harmony of its laws. Those are tendencies natural to the reason, and which were manifest in the Greek world, as the works of Pythagoras, of Plato, and of Aristotle demonstrate; but this tendency which is natural to the reason was arrested in its development by dualistic and polytheistic conceptions. This is why the thoughts of the wise did not reach unto their full

maturity, and remained the monopoly of a small number of minds. Among the founders of modern science, and among contemporary initiators, we find a belief in the unique God, which strengthens the reason in its proper tendencies. This is a question of fact which can only be historically proved. I have collected some of the elements of the proof in the *Revue Scientifique* of Paris (May 15, 1875), and in the *Bibliothèque Universelle* (July and Aug. 1875). The true relation historically established between the Christian religion and science is therefore as follows:— The religious dogmas do not contain the solution of scientific questions: there is no such thing as Christian physics, Christian mathematics, Christian astronomy; but by refining and by generalizing the idea of a God unique and sovereignly wise, Christ has fortified the tendencies of the reason of which science is the result.

Such is my explanation. If it is not admitted, the fact that science and scientific industry are to-day the monopoly of Christian nations would nevertheless subsist. There would then exist a reason for seeking an explanation different to mine, for it would be very strange indeed that the simultaneous presence of a religion and of a considerable development of the human mind (this is the fact that cannot be denied) should be the result of a fortuitous coincidence.

It is important to observe, so as not to discredit my thesis by distorting it, that the point in question is the action exercised upon the human mind by Mono-

theism, and not by the other elements of the Christian doctrine, which have no relation, or at least no direct relation, with the science of nature which has formed the object of my study.

If I were suspected of altering facts under the empire of an apologetical preoccupation, I could give you the declaration of a savant that no such suspicion could reach. M. Du Bois-Reymond, the professor of Berlin, said not long ago in a meeting of German naturalists, at Cologne: 'Though it may sound paradoxical, *modern science owes its origin to Christianity.*' After opposing the absolute Theism which Christianity has spread abroad in the world to the Polytheism of the ancient world, the professor of Berlin continued thus: 'This idea of God, transmitted from generation to generation during many centuries, has ended by reacting upon science itself, and in accustoming the human mind to the conception of a unique reason of things, has inflamed within it the desire of knowing this reason.'

These words are found in the *Revue Scientifique* of Jan. 19, 1878, p. 676. You will understand the satisfaction with which I found in these words of M. Du Bois-Reymond the exact expression of the theses I had sustained. The slow penetration of the human mind by Monotheism is, as to science, the durable work of the Middle Ages, an epoch often appreciated by our modern thinkers with a strange triflingness. This historical view permits us to understand that when the abuses of a false method ceased, when the

laws of astronomy and of physics were sought for in the rational explanation of facts, and not in the texts of Scripture or in the works of Aristotle, modern science took its rise, without there being at that epoch a solution of continuity in the progress of the human mind. Beneath the abuses of Scholasticism the directing principles of the great discoveries were being prepared and fortified.

Question 2.

You attribute the development of modern science to the influence of Christian Monotheism, which affirmed the unity and the harmony of the world. Does not Pantheism contain the same affirmation, and is it not therefore as favourable to the development of science as the Christian doctrine ?

Answer.

Pantheism is that doctrine which makes the universe proceed from a principle without consciousness or liberty, but of a unique principle, which is developed according to the laws of reason. The unity and the harmony of the world are affirmations common to Pantheism and to Christian Theism. For the physical sciences, in the object of which the liberty of creatures does not intervene, it would seem as if the action of both doctrines were similar, seeing that in one case as in the other the savant prosecutes his task under

the influence of the ideas of unity and of harmony; but here is the difference. For the Pantheist, the production of the world is the result of a necessary development, which is accomplished according to the laws of reason. For the Christian, the world is intelligible by the relations established between the laws of understanding and those of phenomena, but the world is the product of a free action. These two doctrines have various consequences for the scientific method. Pantheism makes of the human reason the conscience of universal reason, from which follows, not only that phenomena are intelligible by their relations with thought, but that the laws of phenomena exist in the human mind, which is the necessary development of the principle of the world. The human mind can therefore find in itself, by the alone process of reflection, the *raison d'être* of all that is. From thence, for the sciences, the method *a priori*, or of construction, which has attained its apogee in the system of Hegel. This method has been the source of grave and numerous errors, which modern science has justly repudiated. In the point of view of Christian Theism, the production of the world being a free act, the laws of the world are easily stated. The reason of man, which has the power of *comprehending* them, has not the power of *constructing* them, to discover them *in itself* by the alone process of reflection. It follows from this that experience is the basis and the *controle* of all theories. In this manner the experimental method is justified, a method which must be carefully dis-

tinguished from empirism; and it is to the experimental method that modern science is indebted for its progress.

Pantheism and Christian Theism designate, therefore, in an equally just manner the end to be attained,—the discovery of the laws, harmonic and simple, in which are manifest the unity of the principle of the world; but Pantheism involves thought in a false method, and Theism puts it on the right track. It would be easy to justify this affirmation by salient examples taken from the actual march of physical and natural science. It would be easy to establish that savants who deny the existence of the Almighty and Free God, introduce into contemporary thought, under the mantle of empirism, the products of a purely systematic spirit. But this demonstration would demand developments too lengthy, and of a nature too strictly scientific, to allow them conveniently to take their place here.

FIFTH LECTURE.

Question 3.

In pointing out the dark sides of Roman civilisation (the combats of gladiators, slavery, etc.), have you not left in the shade the luminous sides of that civilisation, —the strong constitution of the family, the respect of home, the care which masters took of their slaves?

As to the institution of slavery, it is doubtless contrary to the spirit of the gospel; but, in a natural point of view, has it not constituted a progress? *Servus* (slave) comes from *servatus* (preserved); such, at least, is the opinion of etymologists. Does not this etymology recall to mind the fact that the preservation of prisoners reduced to servitude has been substituted to the massacre of prisoners, which was the primitive custom? Is not this substitution a progress?

Answer.

I do not dispute any of the facts mentioned by my correspondent. I have not the least intention of denying or of depreciating the real part of virtue which has existed in the Greek and in the Roman world; but my intention was not to appreciate in a general way antique civilisation. I wanted merely to point out the influence exercised by Christianity upon that civilisation. That influence had for effect to fortify the good elements of human nature, and to destroy or to diminish the frightful impurities which the history of antiquity reveals to us. That the action of Christianity has had the results which I have pointed out, is what an impartial study of history will not permit to question. Much light on this subject can be found in numerous works, and particularly in the three following volumes, which were crowned a few years ago by the French Academy:—

Chastel: *Etude historique sur l'influence de la charité*

durant les premiers siècles chrétiens. A vol. in 8vo, Paris 1853.

Champagny: *La charité chrétienne dans les premiers siècles de l'Église.* A vol. in 12mo, Paris 1856.

Schmidt: *Essai historique sur la société civile dans le monde romain et sur sa transformation par le christianisme.* A vol. in 8vo, Paris 1853.

As to the fate of the Roman slaves, it is a fact beyond all doubt that many of them were treated with great kindness, and even as members of the family. Those who belonged to good masters, and who were born in the house, must have found themselves surrounded with affection. They were saved from the reach of misery more securely than the working class of our day. But the revolutions of slaves which took place, at very short intervals, in the years 139, 105, and 73 before our era, witness clearly that those men deprived of liberty were very impatient under the yoke that rested upon them. We must not forget that if the slaves who were born in Roman families became habituated to their condition, it was not the case with the prisoners of war. I reminded you that Seneca, in one of his letters (lxx.), cites three cases of suicide of those wretched men, who voluntarily put themselves to death to prevent their becoming a spectacle to the people in the combats of the circus.

When the book *Uncle Tom* was published, one often heard that the condition of the negroes of the South was not as bad as it had been represented. I remember a narrative which struck me all the more forcibly that it

came from a man who took upon himself the *rôle* of apologist of a servile institution. This is the fact: A rich man had two pretty daughters, nearly perfectly white, from a slave whose blood was already very much mixed. He had them brought up in England in a distinguished boarding-school. Those daughters were to be slaves as well as their mother, by the sole fact of their birth, but the father's firm intention was to enfranchise them. He, however, died suddenly before having put this important business in order. The two young ladies were exposed for sale, and knocked down to the last and highest bidder! Does not a single fact of this nature suffice to judge an institution?

The preservation of prisoners substituted to their massacre was a thing which, without any doubt, must be considered as a progress. I would only remark, that if the fact had had no other origin than the idea of utilizing without profit the men which were killed, it would be the result of a calculation more interested than interesting. Without denying the reality of the progress pointed out, it must not be forgotten that in a certain number of cases the vanquished would have preferred death to slavery. That is true especially with respect to the women. At the time of the war of the independence of Greece, the attention of Europe was riveted by the recital of the death of certain Hellenic young women who, in order to save themselves from falling into the hands of the Turks, danced a funeral round on the edge of a precipice, down which they, one after another, threw themselves.

SIXTH LECTURE.

Question 4.

Is not progress the law of the world, and does it not suffice to account for the social transformations which you place to the honour of the power of Christ? Under the condition of time, all things are organized and ameliorated. The elements of the primitive nebula which formed the dust of the earth have produced by their conjunctions the stars of heaven. Starting from rudimentary organizations, plants and animals have developed themselves, and this evolution has with time produced the present fauna and flora. Does not this great law of progress manifest itself equally in the march of societies which, taking their departure from animality, have attained to civilisation? You must not explain by a special fact, such as the preaching of the Christian doctrine, the effects of a general law.

Answer.

The views which have just been indicated found one day their most complete and their most artless expression in the preface of a French translation of Darwin's work on the *Origin of Species.* The author of the translation affirms that 'mankind, proceeding from nothing, where it had its source, marches onward and rises constantly towards the infinite, its aim and its

end.' This conception is a species of intoxication of the mind. That the astronomical world should have organized itself little by little, starting from a state where the agglomerations did not exist, that is a theory the germ of which is found in the writings of Descartes, which have been developed by Kant, then illustrated by Laplace. But in admitting this hypothesis, can it be affirmed that there exists in the physical world a law of continuous and *indefinite* progress? No. Laplace, after having established against Newton the provisional stability of the system of the world, makes us foresee an epoch incommensurably distant, doubtless, but which science is called to foresee, when our world shall have the destiny of a flower which, having terminated its normal period of existence, shall wither away and die.[1] Recent calculations, founded on the mechanical theory of heat, and to which is specially attached the name of the physicist Claudius, establish the same scientific prevision with respect to the disorganization of the present universe. Whatever be the value attached to these ideas, they are enounced by esteemed savants, a fact which does not allow us to affirm that a continuous and endless progress is the law of the inorganic world.

In admitting for the order of the animal and the vegetable species the theories which bear the name of Darwin, does it follow that one may affirm for the future an *endless* progress of the fauna and of the flora? Not at all. Nothing prevents our admitting

[1] *Exposition du système du monde.*

that a gradual development has brought living beings into a state which is the result of the past, without its being for the future the germ of a superior state. If we reflect on the relations which unite the living beings to the physical world, we shall understand that, if the study of the solar system allows us to foresee the disorganization of the present world, it is impossible to affirm the indefinite progress of plants and of animals.

As to mankind, progress is manifest as a whole, if one considers the great lines of history which converge towards modern civilisation. But this march of mankind admits of recoils and obscurations; those who deny it theoretically, affirm it in certain particular cases, when they are not on their guard. In many orders of things, the start is better than the continuation. This is in particular the affirmation of savants of the first order for the history of religions. There are populations in which progress is active, others in which it is slow, others in which it seems null. Lastly, in certain cases civilisation follows a track which we do not hesitate to qualify as retrograde. How could it be so if progress is an absolute law, similar to that of gravitation? I have asked, and I repeat the question: If the amelioration of human things was necessarily accomplished under the sole condition of time, how could there still be barbarous peoples and savage races? Where progress is realized, it has assignable causes; and there are also in human affairs assignable causes of decadence.

Without any doubt, progress is a law of mankind; but it is not a physical law, which is always fulfilled by inert existences; it is a moral law, it is a *should be*, a rule proposed to free wills. This rule is sometimes followed, sometimes it is violated. The law of progress is nevertheless realized in the long run for the whole of mankind, and thus it manifests the existence of a will superior to the will of men, a will which imposes bounds to their wanderings. What is essential is to discern the sense of the current, in order to contribute to progress instead of putting obstacles in its way. Now, from whence proceeds the current of the good in the bosom of human societies? It has multiple sources, as we have seen; but what is its principal source? Open your eyes: you will then clearly see that, compared with the whole of the populations of the globe, the Christian nations, despite all their miseries, and all their impurities, are delineated as the light upon the shadow. You will thus recognise that the work of Christ, by which all the good elements of the heart, of the conscience, and of the reason, have taken a new life, is the principal factor of the progress of mankind.

The influence of Christianity which is exercised upon the individual conscience, in the order especially religious, radiates in every sense, and modifies the elements of society. With respect to this, I said[1] that Rossi had pointed out this influence upon the domain of political economy. Here are the words which he

[1] First Lecture.

uttered: 'In order that education be efficacious, it must appeal to all the faculties of man, to his belief as well as to his intelligence, to his religious sentiment as well as to his reason, and to law. The salutary influence of Christianity on education has been immense, even though in diminishing this great subject one considered it in the economical point of view.—Men are brethren.—Work is a duty.—Indolence is a vice.—He who has traded with the talents of his master has done well.—He who, instead of trading with them, has buried them, deserves no reward.—She who has supplied her lamp with oil, will enter in and take part in the feast.—She who has neglected this shall be rejected.—Those are the maxims, those are the principles. Now, if political economy took upon itself to draw up a catechism of morality, could it, even from its particular point of view, say anything else? There would be this difference, however: the economist, in enouncing his principles, might appeal to the intelligence, to calculation, to interest; religion appeals to the heart, to the sense of duty, and crowns the edifice by a sanction that man can neither establish nor cast aside. The influence of Christianity on the moral education of the people is the great fact of modern times. Some have disputed its influence upon the enfranchisement of slaves. If by this they meant that Christianity has not suddenly, by a decree, by a blow of the wand, enfranchised the slaves of antiquity, that is true. But what does that prove? Is the principle of Christianity compatible with the principle of slavery? Certainly

not. Well then, in proportion as the principle of Christianity was being developed, and laid hold upon souls, did it not drive away from souls the principle of slavery?

'Christianity has not acted as a revolution, but as a reform. That is, I think, the truth. It has not wished to produce unexpected effects; it has gradually prepared the reform of thought, of sentiment, and by that the reform of morals, of institutions, of the world. Such was its mission, such was the end it sought to reach, and that is the meaning of these words, "My kingdom is not of this world." That is to say, "I do not act directly as a civil legislator would; I want to reform the world simply by the reform of individuals, by the reform of morals." I repeat it, it has not therefore acted as a revolution, but as a reform.

'Christianity has also been reproached with a number of horrors. All these horrors are true; only it is not Christianity that should be made to bear the reproach, but men, precisely in the name of Christianity. I ask you, do we make justice bear the reproach of courts of high commission, of courts of commissioners, of cases heard in private, of torture, and of so many atrocities? Certainly not; we lay the reproach on men, precisely in the name of justice. Well, then, just in the same way, cupidity, the simony of the clergy, the inquisition, and so many other practices tending to perpetuate ignorance, prejudice, and slavery, all these must be reproached to men, and not to Christianity.

'Christianity predisposes to work and to peace; it inspires order, decency, and respect for the rights of others; it admits honest enjoyments, but proscribes gross pleasures and foolish expenditure; it forbids insolent pride in prosperity, and demands resignation in misfortune; in fine, it recommends provident care and charity. Thus, once more, if men desired to reduce this great subject to the proportions of political economy, the gospel would fill all the conditions that science could exact for the development of social wealth.

'We think, then, that the conquests of Christianity interest not only the religious man, the philanthropist, the statesman, but yet the economist; and consequently, to cite an example, the economist also should interest himself in the success of the various missionary societies, of those societies whose extent, whose success, whose progress is a fact at once religious, political, and economical. In fact, by propagating Christianity, these missions educate and civilise. They engender, therefore, the strength of work, they create new wants, and consequently stimulate consumption and exchange, and by those very means, production; they throw down the barriers of barbarism, barriers which the radical diversity of religions, which the need of civilisation and of common wants had erected between the nations; they tend to assimilate the people among themselves, not by taking from each his national character, but by bringing them all under the law of a common, of a Christian brotherhood; they

enlarge existing markets, and create new ones; they have therefore, as I have already said, not only a religious and political, but also an economical importance. The influence of missions is extending daily. You know what proportions English missions have reached. The New World has not remained behind; from its coasts also the principles of Christianity are propagated in distant lands.

'It is a grand and lovely sight is this vast propagation of light, by the means of persuasion and of peace. How different to those works of conquest, of war, or of slavish colonization!'[1]

Pelegrino Rossi spake thus in his lectures on political economy, delivered in the College of France. It would be easy to expound with greater preciseness the nature of the social action of Christianity, and the manner in which it has become, in all the orders, a factor of progress.

SEVENTH LECTURE.

Question 5.

You have said that the Christian religion is the only one that has a future. Do you know this scientifically? The religions which we see declining to-day have also had their period of progress. Who

[1] *Bibliothèque Universelle*, Dec. 1867, pp. 503–505.

can tell us that in a few centuries Christianity will not be in a state of decadence analogous to that which we can see in the religion of Buddha and in that of Mahomet ?

Answer.

The absolute affirmation of the future reserved to Christianity can only be the consequence of faith in the divinity of its origin. To wish to establish it, in an irrefutable manner, by a simple process of reasoning, would be a delusive enterprise. In the scientific point of view, it can only be a question of a simple prevision. It remains to be seen what is the worth and the solidity of the foundations upon which such a prevision is resting.

I have said that Christianity possesses a principle of reform of inward abuses, a principle of reform which is wanting in other religions ; I will reproduce also another remark, the value of which seems to me difficult to disavow.

We can state, in fact, that the Christian doctrine possesses a principle of universality. It adapts itself to all races, to all climates, to all degrees of intellectual culture. The proof of this fact is found, in particular, in the necessity in which the social powers that are hostile to Christianity have been, and are still under, of opposing to its progress the use of material force. Why the imperial persecutions at the time of the Roman Empire ? Why, in modern times, the persecu-

tions inflicted upon Christians in China, in Japan, in Madagascar? I know that in each particular case one can assign the reason to the phenomenon of accidental and local causes, which practically explain it; but those explanations are always partial and insufficient. The fact in its generality demonstrates that at various epochs, in absolutely different circumstances, among all the races, and in every clime, men, following the natural impulse of their conscience and of their heart, have given to the Christian faith a reception which governments have attempted to repress by force. This principle of the universal adaptation of the Christian faith is a unique fact. No other religion bears this character. Contemporary savants (I speak of the most serious) seek to demonstrate that the various religions are the product of a religious sentiment forming part of the constitution of the human soul, a sentiment whose manifestations are modified under the influence of races, of climate, of circumstances. In proportion as this undertaking succeeds, one establishes a law in virtue of which the religions are local and temporary. To establish that law is to put in evidence the exceptional and unique character of Christianity. By opposition to all other beliefs, the Christian faith possesses a universal nature; this is a fact of experience which is confirmed daily. This universality of nature is the basis of the scientific prevision relative to the destinies of the work of Jesus Christ.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Abbé Chatel, the founder of a French Church,	104
Abuse of alcohol,	70
Açoka embraces Buddhism,	197
Africa, Klunzinger on the men-hunters of, 131; Banning on the desolation caused by the slave-trade in, 132; slave-trade in,	131
Ahola Pélé, goddess of subterranean fires,	48
Alcohol, abuse of,	70
Aleutian Islands, missionaries in the,	158
Alexander and Cæsar, how they prepared the work of the Gospel,	179
Alfred de Musset, reply to socialists by, 23; his opinion of Christianity,	24
Alipius in the Coliseum of Rome,	136
Altaian Mountains, missionaries in the,	158
Ambulances on the battle-field,	42
Ampère on the harmony of the world,	49
Ancestors of the Christians, the Jews considered as the,	31
Ancient India,	154
Andrieux the poet and Frederick II., King of Prussia, anecdote of,	204
Announcement of Christ's resurrection incontestable,	82
Antiquity, consolations offered by the sages of,	70-74
Apostles, the, their teaching as to the death of Christ,	91, 92
Apostolic times, difficulties among Christians in the,	149
Arabs, their need of slaves,	131
Archipelago, Polynesian, Captain Duperré's report on the,	169
Aristotle, the teaching of,	45
Art, Christian,	148
Aspects under which the New Testament presents itself,	11
Aspects under which the volume of the Scriptures presents itself,	13
Association, Fourier's ideas of,	63
Atheism, during the French Revolution, 35; the great opponent of Christianity, 36; renaissance of, 37; its influence upon the working-classes, 37; its influence upon the middle-classes, 38; in England during the 18th century, Disraeli's opinion of,	39
Atheistic savants,	49, 50
Atheistic tendencies in France, Robespierre reacting against,	35
Athens, Paul at,	15, 30, 74, 75, 101
Attempts at civilisation without the aid of Christianity,	102, 103
Auguste Choisy on polygamy and slavery,	195

PAGE

Auguste Cochin on the work of Protestant missionaries in Labrador, . . . 165

Balzac on the future of Christianity, . . . 208
Banning on the desolation caused by the slave-trade in Africa, . . . 132
Barthélemy St. Hilaire on the combined efforts of the British Government and some French priests for the suppression of human sacrifices in India, . . 94
Belgians, King of the, his efforts to put down slavery, ... 131
Beneficence, evangelical, 122; works of, who originated by, 123, 124; as a conductor to faith, 124; Julian the Emperor on Christian, . . . 122
Bera, human sacrifices offered to, . . . 94
Béranger on the desire for happiness, 56; on human disappointments, . . 56
Bernoville's testimony concerning the Exhibition of 1851, ... 51
Bible, the, converted into an encyclopædia of sciences, 45
Birmans, the Emperor of the, his letter to Max Müller, ... 156
Blanqui on the social condition of Turkey in Europe, 155
Body, pains of the, . . 64
Boerhaave's favourite maxim, 46
Boileau's idea of the gospel, 57
Bonaparte, his impression of the Christ, . . . 174
Bossuet, his panegyric of St. Paul, ... 148
Brahmins, the missionary schemes of the, . . 156
Bribery, electoral, among the Romans, . . . 134
Bruno driven from Geneva, 45

PAGE

Buddha, 196, 197; religion of, ... 156
Buddhism embraced and enforced by Açoka, 197; visible decline of, . 197, 198
Buxton, his efforts to put down slavery, . . . 129

Cæsar, what are the claims of, ... 116
Cæsar and Alexander, . 179
Cæsar and Jesus Christ, . 39
Campania, gladiatorial combats at, ... 134
Cannibalism sometimes the outcome of famine, . . 96
Carpenter of Nazareth, the, His action on science and industry, . . 52–54
Catholics, fervent, . . 7
Cato, his ideas of immortality, ... 84
Cemetery, two scenes at a, . 85
Characteristics of the gospel, special, ... 146
Charity, definition of, 119; as taught in the Indian scriptures, . . . 147
Charity of the law, inconveniences of the, . . 125
Charlemagne compels the Saxons to accept Christianity, ... 153
Charles Martel at Poitiers, . 152
Châteaubriand, his ideas of the influence of the gospel upon arts, . . . 18
Cherokees, the gospel among the, ... 203
China, the great industry and, 51, 52; civilisation in, 154; ideas of sin and pardon in, . . . 88
Choctaws, the gospel among the, ... 203
Choisy, Auguste, on polygamy and slavery, . . 195
Chriestlieb on the opium traffic, ... 161
Christ, as *man*, not the Creator of reason, 33; His

PAGE

influence upon reason, 33; the great propagator and conserver of the doctrine of the unity of God, 34; His power of consolation, 57; His teaching as to the future, 81; His resurrection, 12, 81; His promises, glorious, 85; His teaching on the use of the sword and of fire, 141, 142; the assertion of the divine mission of the, 5, 6; faith in, produces a church organization, 8; His nativity, 12; the life of, 12; separation of the thought from, what it involves, 15; His kingdom far from being established, 145; His unparalleled glory, 147; what leads to, 178
Christendom, reconciliation effected between the two branches of Western, 25; assertion of the divine mission of Christ in, . . 5, 6
Christian art, . . . 148
Christian benevolence, superiority of, 121, 122; the Emperor Julian on, . 122
Christian Church, what it is founded upon, 93; became the instigator of persecutors, . . . 140
Christian communities, difficulties which arose in, in apostolic times, . . 149
Christian influence, consequences of the destruction of, ... 90
Christian missions, duty of Christians towards the, 162, 163; success of, 173, 174; Darwin on the, . 170
Christian philosophy, Troplong on, . . . 113
Christian preaching, influence of, ... 93
Christian religion, the teaching of Jesus concerning

PAGE

the, 145; Montesquieu on the, . . . 199, 200
Christian slave, his position in the Primitive Church, 126, 127
Christian teaching, the fundamental basis of, . . 30
Christianity, its twofold action upon human sacrifices, 99; Vinet on, 102; Laplace on, 169; Max Müller on, 193; compared with the religions of Mahomet and of Buddha, 193, 194; the secret of European civilisation, 156; Balzac on the future of, 208; acted not as a revolution, but as a reform, 228; reproached with a number of horrors, 228; disposes to work and to peace, 229; its influence upon political economy, 226; its influence upon the development of compassion, 123; its position before its foes, 24; viewed by the partisans of the naturalistic solution, 179, 185; its expansive power, 200, 201; the future reserved to, 231; Charlemagne compels the Saxons to embrace, 153; Du Bois-Reymond on, . . . 216
Christians teach the unity of God, 31; accused and persecuted by Nero, 150; persecuted under Julian, 142; often compromise their cause, 12; Jews considered as the ancestors of the, 31; not Stoics, . 76
Christopher Columbus, . 26
Chromacius, liberation of slaves by, . . . 127
Church, matters of the, should be separate from state matters, 21; organization of a, one of the products of simple faith

PAGE

in Christ, 8; the word of the, ... 14
Cicero, his teaching, . . 59
Civil powers, how religion has been imposed by, . 21
Civil right of the Romans, Troplong on the, . . 113
Civilisation, European, 17; attempts at, without the aid of Christianity, 101, 102; superiority of the Christian, 156; modern, 17, 18; whence springs our, 113; Mussulman, . 195
Civilisations, comparison between the Christian and other, . . . 154, 155
Clergy, the, should not have command of the temporal power, ... 21
Cochin, Auguste, on the work of Protestant missionaries in Labrador, . 165
Coliseum of Rome, . . 133
Comforters, human, among the ancients, . . . 59
Commodus, re-institution of human slaughter by, 98; in the arena, . . . 135
Comparative religions, 20; the study of, . . 192, 193
Comparison between Christian and other civilisations, . . . 154, 155
Compassion, the influence of Christianity upon the development of, . . 123
Complaint universal, the sources of, . . . 64
Compulsory conversions, the effect of, . . 153, 154
Conception, supernatural, of Jesus, admitted by Mahomet, ... 32
Condition of man, Voltaire on the, 62; Pascal on the, 60
Conflicts between theologians and scientists, . 50
Conscience, the state of the, 86
Consequences of the destruction of Christian influence, 19

PAGE

Consequences of the suppression of the gospel, . 19
Consolation, need of, 57; offered by the sages of antiquity, 70–74; whence arises the need of, . . 86
Constantine, prohibition of gladiatorial combats by, . 137
Contemporary missions, difficulties of, . . 158, 159
Convention, famous decree of the French, . . 35
Conversions, the effects of compulsory, . . 153, 154
Copernicus, the partisans of, 46; on the simplicity of the laws of the world, . 46
Corinth, Paul at, 101, 148, 149
Creed of Robespierre, Rousseau's opinion of the, . 105
Criticism, historical, 20; what it rests upon, . . 12
Cross, the, as a decoration, 110; as a sign of neutrality, 110; Lamartine on the, ... 111
Crucifix, Lamartine on the, 111
Culture, materialism the enemy of all religious, . 20
Customs, the influence of the gospel upon our, . 18
Czar of Russia, serfdom abolished by the, . . 129

Damocles and Dionysius, . 67
Dante on the idea of the miraculous, . . 189, 190
Dante Alighieri on the truth of the gospel, . . . 179
Darwin on the Christian missions of Tahiti and New Zealand, 170; translator of *The Origin of Species*, 223
De Varigny's report on the Sandwich Islands, . . 171
Death, prospects of, 66, 67; what is, 76, 81; the terrible, consolation of the despairing, 66; as viewed by Epicurus, 71, 72; as viewed by Epictetus, . 73

PAGE
Decline of Buddhism, 197, 198
Decree of the French Convention, ... 36
Decree of the Genevese Convention with respect to the teaching of Aristotle, 45
Deism no longer the system opposed to the faith of Christians, 36; in the 18th century, 34; Voltaire's, 34; Rousseau's, 34, 35
Democritus, revival of the doctrines of, . . . 37
Desire for happiness, indestructible, . . . 55
Different forms assumed by religious speech, the, . 14
Difficulties in the apostolic times, 149; of contemporary missions, . 158, 159
Dionysius and Damocles, . 66
Disciples of Christ, their duty with respect to suffering and distress, . 76, 77
Disciples of the Vedas and of the Buddhists, their ideas of immortality, . . 83
Disraeli, his opinion of Atheism in England in the 18th century, . . 38
Dissipation of pleasure, . 70
Distress, the Christian's duty with respect to, 76, 77
Divine love, . . . 75
Doctrines of Mahomet and of Christianity, the, . 31
Dualism, ... 28
Du Bois-Reymond on science and Christianity, . . 216
Duperré, Captain, his report on Polynesia, . . . 169
Dupuis, his opinion of Jesus, ... 182
Duty of Christians to foreign missions, . . 162, 163

EARTH, inhabitants of the, organizing themselves into unity, ... 3
Eastern Church, the Orthodox, missions of, . . . 158
PAGE
Electoral bribery, gladiatorial combats among the Romans, a means of, . 134
Emile de Saisset, his opinions of the gospel, . . . 184
Encyclopædists, religious belief attacked by the, . 24
England and China, . . 161
Enjoyment, when rest is an, 65
Envy, the growing equality in earthly conditions increases, ... 63
Epictetus, morality of, 72, 73; on death, . . 73
Epicurus, doctrines of, 37; thoughts on life, sickness, death, eternity, 70–72; Zeno and, compared, 74; revival of the doctrines of, 37
Equality, growing, a source of envy, ... 63
Esquimaux, the ship *Graham* and the, . . . 170, 171
Essentials of Christian prayer, . . . 88, 89
Europe, what the heathen behold in, . . . 161
European civilisation, whence it comes, 17; superiority of, 156
European settlers, their behaviour to the Tasmanians, 160
Evangelical beneficence, superiority of, 122; works of, who originated by, 123, 124; as a conductor to faith, 124; Julian the Emperor on, . . . 122
Evil socialism, the nature of, 22
Exhibition of 1851, Bernoville's report on the, . 51
Existence, happiness in, . 56
Exterior obstacles to the work of Christ, . . 187

FAITH in Christ, one of the natural products of, 8; position of, . . . 27
Famine, cannibalism has sometimes originated in, 96
Famous decree of the French Convention, . . 3

PAGE

Faraday on the harmony of the world, . . . 49
Father Gratry, his thoughts on death, . . 67, 69
Fauna, progress of the, . 224
Fervent Catholics, . . 7
Fire, the teaching of Christ on the employment of, 141, 142
Flora, progress of the, . 224
Forces of nature, how to utilize the, . . . 52
Forgiveness, whence arises the need of, . . . 87
Founders of modern science, the belief of the, . 49, 50
Fourier, doctrines of, on association, . . . 63
France, general persecution of the Christians in, 142; the Mahometans attack, . 152
France and the Polynesians, 160
Frederick II., King of Prussia, and Andrieux the poet, ... 204
French and German writers on Paganism, . . . 57
French Revolution, Atheism during the, 35; Thiers on the, 35; Lamennais on the, ... 35
Fresnel, his theory of luminous undulations, 46; on the harmony of the world, 49
Future, the, reserved to Christianity, 231; the teaching of Christ as to, 81; Socrates on, . . 83

Galileo, a Roman tribunal condemns, . . . 45
Garémoff on the Altaian missions, . . . 157
Gauls, human sacrifices among the, . . . 95
General persecution of the Christians in France, . 142
Geneva, Bruno driven from, 45
Gerland, Dr., on the Tasmanians, . . . 160
German and French writers on Paganism, . . . 57

PAGE

Gladiatorial combats a means of electoral bribery in Rome, 134; instituted by will and testament, 134; in Campagna, 134; a public institution, 135; prohibited by Constantine, 137; Livy on, 134; Schmidt on, . . . 135
Gladiators of Rome, 133; suicide of three, 134; maintained at the cost of the state, . . . 135
God, a work of, what it supposes, 5; supreme unity of, 29; sages of Greece taught the unity of, 33; truce of, 41; claims of, . 116
Good Samaritans, . . 42
Gospel, the, its influence upon our laws, customs, science, and arts, 18; Boileau's idea of, 57; the religion of, 146; Dante Alighieri on the truth of, 179; Emile de Saisset's opinion of, 184; influence of, upon our ideas, 18; consequences of the suppression of, 19; the nature of, 122; its effects upon slavery, 126; special characteristics of, 146; among the Cherokees and Choctaws, ... 203
Graham, the ship, the Esquimaux and, . . 170, 171
Gratry, Father, on the effects of Christian beneficence, 124, 125; his thoughts on death, . . . 67–69
Greece, the unity of God taught by the sages of, . 33
Greenlanders in Paris, . 162
Gregory XVI., Pope, abolition of slavery by, . . 133
Griefs, hidden, . . . 65
Growth of envy, . . 63

Happiness, desire for, indestructible, 51; Pascal on,

PAGE

55; in the bare fact of existing, . . . 56
Harmony of the world, the founders of modern science were guided by the idea of the, 46; Kepler, Newton, Galileo, and Copernicus on the, . . . 49
Havaï, visit to the island of, ... 47
Health of body and soul, joy the sign of, . . . 56
Heathen, the, what they behold in Europe, . . 161
Hebrew prophets, their mission admitted by Mahomet, 82
Hellenic young women, death of two, ... 222
Hermes, liberation of slaves by, ... 127
Herschell on science, . . 44
Hidden griefs, . . . 65
Hindoo, Max Müller's anecdote of a converted, . 162
Hindrances to the work of Christian missions, 158, 159
Historical criticism, . . 20
Historical document, the New Testament considered as a, ... 11
Hobbes, his idea of men in their relations with each other, ... 39
Holiness of the law, the importance of imprinting upon the mind the idea of the, ... 89
Homer on the destinies of man, ... 58
Honorius, celebration of the anniversary of the consulate of, at Rome, . . 137
Hope of immortality not the monopoly of Christians, . 83
Horace on human sacrifices, 98
Houses of mourning, scenes at two, . . . 84, 85

IDEAS of offering and atonement involved in human sacrifices, 95; of some

PAGE

German and French writers on paganism, 57; influence of the gospel upon our, . 18
Idolatry a corruption of the primitive dogmas, 33; Jews given to, . . 186
Idols, the only effectual way of overthrowing, . . 48
Immortality not the monopoly of the Christian faith, 83; disciples of the Vedas and the Buddhists on, 83; Socrates on, 83; Cato on, 84
Increasing and durable joys, 66
India, ancient, 154; how industry has been established in, . . . 51
Indians, attempt to civilise, without the aid of Christianity, ... 102
Industry, influence of modern science upon, 50, 51; the monopoly of Christian nations, 51; how established in India, 51; how received in Japan, 51; how received in China, . 51, 52
Influence of Christian preaching, ... 93
Inhabitants of the earth tending towards unity, . 3
Institution of the Lord's Supper, . . . 90, 91
Insufficiency of the joys of earth, ... 77
Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, . 48
Island of Havaï, a visit to the, ... 47

JAPAN, how our industry is received in, . . . 51
Jean Rouge, the apostle of the German Catholic Church in Paris, . . 104
Jesus, His teaching concerning the establishment of His kingdom, 145; the sons of Zebedee and, 117, 118; the young ruler, 118, 119; considered simply as a Teacher, 27;

PAGE

His teaching as to the origin of the universe, 27, 29; Mahomet admits the supernatural conception of, 32; Renan's opinion of, 111, 112; the work of pardon and the death of, 90; Dupuis' opinion of, 182; various opinions concerning, 185, 186; at Sychar, 2; opposition to, 3; Nicodemus and, 26, 27; Moses and, . . 29, 30
Jesus Christ, His work with respect to human misery, 77; announces Himself as the Saviour of the lost, 87; the Redeemer, 92; had no political power, 113; how He has exercised His work of legislatorship, 15; Cæsar and, ... 39
Jews, unity of God taught by the, 31; inclined to idolatry, 186; present position of the, 205, 206; expectation of the, 1; considered as the ancestors of the Christians, . . 31
Jouffroy, the destruction of every religious element in, ... 15–17
Joy, the object of the heart, 55; our destination, 56; the sign of health of body and soul, 56; can be produced by sorrow, . . 179
Joys, thoughts of Zeno on physical, 72; insufficiency of earthly joys, 77; the nature of this life's, 65, 66; increasing and durable, 66
Julian the Emperor, on Christian beneficence, 122; persecution of Christians by, ... 152
Julius Cæsar on human sacrifices, . . . 96

Kajaks, the ship *Graham* and the, . . . 170, 171

PAGE

Kepler on the harmony of the world, . . . 49
Khonds, human sacrifices among the, . . . 93
King Frederick II. of Prussia and Andrieux the poet, 204
King of the Belgians, his efforts to put down slavery, 131
Kingdom of Christ is far from being established, . 145
Klunzinger on the menhunters of Africa, . . 131

Laic, double sense attached to the term, . . 21, 22
Lamartine on the crucifix, 111
Lamennais on the French Revolution, . . . 35
Laplace on Christianity, . 169
Law, inconveniences of the charity of the, . . 125
Laws, influence of the gospel upon our, 18; simplicity of the world's, 46; Fresnel, Ampère, and Faraday on the simplicity of, ... 49
Liebig on modern science, . 44
Life, Béranger on the disappointments of, 56; the estimate suicides put upon, 56; the nature of the joys of, 65; views of Epicurus on, 70, 71; views of Zeno on, 72; views of Epictetus on, 72, 73
Livingstone, his efforts to put down slavery, 131; his ideas of Mahometan propagandism in Africa, 157; critique of the work of a superintendent of missions, . . 163, 164
Livy on gladiatorial combats, 133
Lord's Supper, institution of the, . . . 90, 91
Loui-Ching, the god of thunder, . . . 47
Louis XV., his title, . . 138
Luminous undulations, Fresnel's theory of, . 46

PAGE

MAHOMET, 152; on the unity of God, 31; proclaims the God of Abraham, 32; admits the divine mission of the Hebrew prophets, 32; and the supernatural conception of Jesus, . . . 32
Mahometanism, 31; a detached branch of Christianity, . . . 193, 194
Mahometans, 31; France attacked by the, 152; Spain and Portugal conquered by the, . . 152
Malkoff, missionary to the valleys of the Altaï, . 157
Man brought face to face with his conscience, . 87
Mankind, progress of, . 225
Massacre of St. Bartholomew, ... 142
Materialism, theory of, on the origin of the universe, 28; the enemy of all religious culture, 20; the natural product of reason in its infancy, 28; when it will disappear, . 28, 29
Max Müller, letter received from the Emperor of the Birmans by, 156; anecdote of a converted Hindoo by, 162; on Christianity, . . . 193
Men-hunters in Africa, Klunzinger on, . . 131
Middle-classes, the influence of Atheism upon the, . 38
Mimmermus on the destinies of man, . . 58
Miracle, definition of a, 189, 190
Mission of Christ, all Christendom asserts the divine, 5, 6
Mission work on the Altaian Mountains, . . . 157
Missionary work, difficulties of, arising from the missionaries themselves, 163; difficulties of, 158; sailors and merchants hinder, 158, 159

PAGE

Modern civilisation, nature of, ... 17, 18
Modern science, the influence of Monotheism upon, 44; date of, 44; the belief of the founders and initiators of, . . 49, 50
Monotheism the teaching of Jesus, 29; not the monopoly of Jews, Christians, and Mahometans, 33; its influence upon war, 41–43; its influence upon science, 44; its influence upon industry, 50, 51; not natural to the Jews, . 186
Montesquieu on the influence of the gospel upon our laws, 18; on the Christian religion, . 199, 200
Moses and Jesus, . 29, 30
Müller, John de, on the appearance of the gospel, 187
Mussulman civilisation, blots upon the, . . 195

NANTES, revocation of the edict of, ... 142
Nature, how to utilize the forces of, . . . 52
Naville on the renaissance of Atheism, . . . 37
Need of consolation, whence arises the, . . . 86
Need of forgiveness, whence arises the, . . . 87
Need of progress, . 210, 211
Negro trade, origin of the, 128
Negroes sold in Paris, . 128
Nero, Rome burnt by, 149; the accuser and persecutor of the Christians, . . 150
New Testament, the two aspects under which it presents itself, 11; as a historical document, . 11
Newton on the simplicity of the laws of the world, 46
Nicodemus and Jesus, . 26
North American Indian chief, complaint of a, . 159

PAGE

Observation, science not simply the result of, 45, 46
Obstacles to the work of Christ, the exterior, . 187
Offering, sacrifice contains the element of, . . 95
Olympus, summits of, . 40
Opinions concerning Jesus, various, . . 185, 186
Opium among the Chinese, 70; how introduced in China, ... 161
Opium traffic, Chriestlieb on the, ... 161
Opposition to Jesus, . . 3
Order of Redemption, institution of the, . . 92
Organization, faith in Christ results in a church, 8
Origin of human sacrifices, 88, 95
Origin of the negro trade, 127, 128
Origin of the universe, Jesus on the, 27, 28; Pantheistic idea of the, . . 29
Origin of Species, translator of Darwin's work on the, . . . 223, 224
Orthodox Eastern Church, missions of the, . . 157
Overthrow of idols, the only means of the, . . . 18

Pacification, how far its work has gone, . 40, 41
Paganism, ideas of some French and German writers on, . . . 57
Pain, salutary functions of, 80
Pains, of the body, 64; of the mind, . . . 65
Panegyric of St. Paul, Bossuet's, . . . 148
Pantheism, on the origin of the universe, 29; what is, 217; Christian Theism and, ... 217
Papuans, the, . . . 202
Pardon, the doctrine and effects of, . . . 107
Paris, Greenlanders in, 162; negroes sold in, . . 128

PAGE

Pascal on happiness, 55; on the condition of man, 60; his remarks on Seneca's ideas of suicide, 73; on the essence of sin, 87
Paul at Athens, 15, 20, 75, 101; at Corinth, 101, 148, 149
Paul of Tarsus, 148, 149; Bossuet's panegyric of, . 148
Penthièvre, Duke of, on the sale of negroes in Paris, . 128
Persia, the Shah of, in Europe, ... 162
Philosophy, Troplong on Christian, . . . 113
Physical joys, thoughts of Zeno on, . . . 72
Plato on suicide, . . 74
Plato and Socrates, how they prepared the work of the gospel, . . . 179
Pleasure, dissipation of, . 70
Pliny the Elder on human sacrifices, . . . 98
Pliny's letter to Trajan, . 151
Police force, how long necessary, . . . 43
Political economy, Rossi on the influence of Christianity upon, . . 227–229
Politics, ... 21
Polygamy, mortal consequences of, 155; Auguste Choisy on, . . . 195
Polynesians, France and the, 160
Polytheism, on the origin of the universe, 128; its evil influence upon reason, 47
Portugal, the Mahometans conquer, . . . 152
Position of faith, the, . 27
Positivism, the working-classes and, . . . 38
Power, our, results from our knowledge, . . 52
Prayer, essentials of Christian, ... 89
Prayers of the heathen, . 89
Preaching of the gospel, how it acts upon public morals, . . . 168, 169

PAGE

President of the United States on the North American Indians, . . 159
Productions of China, Japan, and Cashmere, . 51
Progress, a law of mankind, 226; of the world since Voltaire's day, 62, 63; need of, 210, 211; a moral, not a physical law, ... 226
Progress of mankind, . 225
Progress of the fauna and the flora, . . . 224
Promises of Christ, glorious, 85
Propagandism, Livingstone on Mahometan, in Africa, 157
Proselytism engendered by religious faith, . . 156
Prospect of death, Father Gratry on the, . 67–69
Protestant missionaries in Labrador, Auguste Cochin on the work of, . . 165
Protestants, zealous, . . 7
Proudhon, his ideas on the alternative—*Christian or Atheist*, 36; on Christianity, ... 36
Province of science, . . 12
Psalms, anecdote of the revision of the, in Geneva, 12
Public morals, effects of the preaching of the gospel upon, . . . 168, 169
Public place, the word of the, . . . 14, 15

QUAKERS, their work with respect to the abolition of slavery, . . . 129

REASON, how it sets towards unity, 33; not created by the *man* Christ Jesus, 33; how regarded by Pantheists, . . . 218
Reconciliation effected between the two branches of Western Christendom, 25
Redemption, Vinet on, 102; the doctrine of Christian, 97; the firmest prop of religious truth, 101; the order of, . . . 92
Relations between science and religion, . . 212, 213
Religion, comparative, 20; civil powers imposed, 21; social influence of, 21; natural, used as a stepping stone to Christianity, 102, 103; attempts at preserving without the aid of Christianity, 104; of the Theophilanthropists, 104; the state and, 139, 140; statistics of the Christian, 145; of Buddha, 156; of Mahomet compared with Christianity, 193; of Buddha compared with Christianity, 194, 195; Montesquieu on the Christian, 200; relations between science and, 213, 214
Religions, the study of comparative, . . 192, 193
Religions of the earth, statistics of the, . . . 145
Religious culture, materialism the enemy of, . . 20
Religious element, the, destroyed by separation of the thought from Christ, 15
Religious ideas, their influence upon the wars of nations, ... 40
Religious speech, the two forms it assumes, . . 14
Religious truth, firmest prop of, ... 101
Renan, his ideas concerning Jesus, . . . 181, 182
Report of the French Commission on the Exhibition of 1851, ... 51
Rest, when it is an enjoyment, ... 65
Resurrection of Jesus Christ, 81; Reuss of Strasbourg

PAGE

on the, 83; announcement of, incontestable, . . 82
Reuss on the resurrection of Christ, 83; on the actions of Jesus, . 187, 188
Revival of the doctrines of Democritus and Epicurus, 37
Revocation of the edict of Nantes, ... 142
Revolution of 1848 and the Commune of 1871, contrast between the, . . 38
Revolutions of slaves, . 221
Richet, Dr., on pain, . . 80
Robespierre, his reaction against Atheistic tendencies, 35; the French Convention and, 35, 36; Rousseau's opinion of the creed of, ... 105
Roman tribunal, Galileo condemned by a, . . 45
Romans, electoral bribery among the, . . . 134
Rome, the Coliseum of, 133; gladiators of, 133; burnt by Nero, 149, 150; the missions of the Church of, 158
Rossi on the influence of the gospel upon political economy, 18; on the influence of Christianity upon political economy, 226, 227
Rousseau, deism of, 34, 35; his influence upon the religious thought of his contemporaries, 36; on the natural compassion of the human heart, 121; on the creed of Robespierre, 105

Sacrifice, the elements of offering and atonement in, 95
Sacrifices, human, effects of Christian preaching upon, 93; the Khonds and, 93; offered to Bera, 94; origin of, 95; the Gauls and, 95; Julius Cæsar on, 96; ideas of the Mexicans on, 96,

PAGE

97; the Greeks and Romans and, 98; Horace's poems on, 98; Pliny the Elder on, 98; the Society Islands and, 99; disappearance of the custom of offering, . . 97, 98
Sages of Greece, unity of God taught by the, . . 33
Salvation of the world, what it supposes, . . . 5
Samaritans, their opinion of Jesus, 2; good, . . 42
Sandwich Islands, De Varigny's report on the, 171; arrival of first missionaries in, . . . 172
Saurin on faithfulness to the dying, ... 109
Savants, atheistic, . 49, 50
Saxons, the, compelled by Charlemagne to accept Christianity, . . . 153
Scenes, two, at a cemetery, 85
Schmidt on gladiatorial combats, . . . 135
Science, influence of monotheism upon, 44; modern, 44; Herschell, Humboldt, and Liebig on, 44; not simply the result of observation, 46; arrested in its course by Polytheism, 47; founders and initiators of, have all believed in God, 49; the Mahometans and, 155; province of, 12; date of modern, 44; Christian, 50; relations between religion and, 213, 214
Scientists and theologians, conflicts between, . . 50
Scriptures, two different aspects of the, . . 13
Seneca on suicide, . . 73
Separation of the thought from Christ, results of the, 15
Serfdom, the Czar of Russia abolishes, . . . 129
Shah of Persia, his visit to Europe, ... 162

PAGE

Simplicity of the laws of the world, Copernicus, Newton, and Fresnel on the, ... 46
Sin, Pascal on the essence of, ... 87
Sin and pardon, the idea of, not the monopoly of Christian doctrine, . . . 88
Slave-trade in Africa, . . 131
Slave-ship, arrival of first, in Europe, . . . 127
Slavery, 125; effects of the gospel upon, 126; Mahometan countries and, 121; Livingstone's efforts to abolish, 131, 132; Wilberforce and, 129; Quakers and, ... 129
Slaves, liberation of, by Hermes and Chromacius, 127; Turks and Arabs need, 131; position of, in ancient society, 125; position of the Christian, in the Primitive Church, 126, 127; revolutions of, 221; anecdote of, . . 222
Social influence of religion, 21
Socialism, evil, the nature of, 22
Society, importance of the question of the nature of Christ upon, . . 17, 18
Society Islands, account of a visit to the, . . 99, 100
Socrates, his ideas of immortality, . . . 83
Socrates and Plato, . . . 179
Sorrow, how it can become the cause of joy, . . 79
Soul, pains of the, . . 65
South Sea Islands, anecdote of Williams, the missionary to the, . . 161
Spain, the Mahometans conquer, ... 152
Spartacus, revolt of, . . 126
Special characteristics of the gospel, ... 146
Speech, religious, the two different forms it assumes, 14

PAGE

St. Bartholomew, the massacre of, . . . 142
State and religion, . 139, 140
State matters and Church matters, ... 122
Statistics, religious, . . 145
Stoics, the, 146, 179; the morality of the, 72; Christians not, . . . 76
Success of Christian missions, 173, 174; Darwin on the, ... 170
Suffering, the Christian accepts, 78, 79; the Christian welcomes, 79, 80; the Christian's duty with respect to, 76, 77; the work of Christ with respect to, . . . 78
Suicide, Pythagoras and Plato on, 74; Seneca on, 73; of three gladiators, . 134
Summit of Olympus, . . 40
Sunshine, when it is not the predominant feature in life, ... 56
Supernatural conception of Jesus admitted by Mahomet, ... 32
Supper of the Lord, institution of the, . . 90, 91
Suppression of the gospel, consequences of the, . 19
Sword, Christ's teaching on the employment of the, 141, 142
Sychar, Jesus at, . . 2

TACITUS on the Christians, 150; his testimony concerning the origin of Christianity, . . . 183
Tahiti, Darwin on the success of Christian missions in, ... 170
Tasmanians, the, behaviour of Europeans towards, 160; Dr. Gerland on, . 160
Telemachus in the Coliseum of Rome, . . . 137
Temporal power, the clergy should not command the, 21

PAGE

Terror, days of the, . . 24
Tertullian, his address, 150, 151
Testament, New, viewed as a historical document, . 11
Theism, Christian, and Pantheism, ... 217
Theognis of Megara on the destinies of man, . . 58
Theologians and scientists, conflicts between, . . 50
Theophilanthropists, religion of the, . . . 104
Thiers on the French Revolution, ... 35
Titus hands over captive Jews for the combats of the Roman Coliseum, . 136
Tomb, how the Christian should regard the, . . 85
Töpffer on the influence of the gospel upon our arts, ... 18
Trajan, Pliny's letter to, . 151
Trauses, the, at the birth of a child, ... 59
Troplong on the influence of the gospel upon our laws, 18; on Christian philosophy, ... 113
Truce of God, what is meant by the, ... 41
Truth the object of reason, 55
Turkey in Europe, Blanqui on the social condition of, ... 155
Turks, their need of slaves, 131

Unconverted persons in the Church in the days of Constantine, . . 152, 153
Undulations, luminous, Fresnel's theory of, . . 46
Unity, the inhabitants of the earth tending towards, 3
Unity of God, 29; where taught, 31; as taught by Mahomet, . . . 31
Universal complaint, the sources of, . . . 64
Universality, Christianity possesses a principle of, . 231

PAGE

Universe, the teaching of Jesus on the origin of the, . . . 27, 29

Varigny, de, his report on the Sandwich Islands, . 171
Vedas, their doctrine of sin and pardon, . . . 88
Victor Hugo, his opinion of Voltaire, . . . 34
Vincent de Paul, . . 124
Vinet on the doctrine of redemption, . . . 102
Visible decline of Buddhism, 197, 198
Vogt, M., on the ideas of atonement involved in human sacrifices, . . 95
Volcano in the Island of Havaï, visit to a, . . 47
Voltaire, deism of, 34; Victor Hugo's opinion of, 34; his criticism of Pascal, 60; on the condition of man, . . . 62

War, progress made in, 41, 42; the influence of Monotheism upon, . . 41–43
Western Christendom, reconciliation between the two branches of, . . 25
Wilberforce and the abolition of slavery, . . 129
Williams, missionary to the South Sea Islands, anecdote of, ... 161
Women, death of two young Hellenic, ... 222
Word of Christ, the influence of the, . . . 117
Word, of the Church, 14; of the public place, . . 15
Work of Christ, exterior obstacles to the, . . 187
Work of God, a, what it supposes, . . . 5
Work of the missions, hindrances to the, . 158, 159
Working-classes, Atheism among the, . . . 37

PAGE
Works of beneficence, the originators of, . 123, 124
World, harmony of the, 46; simplicity of the laws of the, 46; salvation of the, what it supposes, 5; progress of, since Voltaire's day, . . . 62, 63
Zealous Protestants, . . 7
Zebedee, Jesus and the sons of, ... 117, 118
Zeno on physical joys, . 72
Zeno and Epicurus compared, ... 74

THE END.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 8s. 6d.,

SYNTAX

OF

THE HEBREW LANGUAGE

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By HEINRICH EWALD.

Translated from the Eighth German Edition.

By JAMES KENNEDY, B.D.

Just published, in demy 4to, price 25s.,

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

By Professor CREMER, of Greifswald.

Translated from the German of the Second Edition

(WITH ADDITIONAL MATTER AND CORRECTIONS BY THE AUTHOR).

By WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

'A painstaking and reverential spirit is manifest throughout his work. Wherever we have consulted it, we have been well satisfied with the explanations given, and do not hesitate to recommend it as a valuable addition to biblical study.'—*(London) Record.*

'We very heartily recommend this goodly volume to students of biblical literature. The translation is clear and scholarly.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

PUBLICATIONS OF

T. AND T. CLARK,

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.

Adam (John, D.D.)—An Exposition of the Epistle of James. With an Appendix of Dissertations. 8vo, 9s.

Alexander (Dr. J. A.)—Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. New and Revised Edition. With a Preface by John Eadie, D.D., LL.D. Two vols. 8vo, 17s.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library—A Collection of all the Works of the Fathers of the Christian Church prior to the Council of Nicæa. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £6, 6s.

Augustine's Works—Edited by Marcus Dods, D.D. Sixteen vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £4, 4s.

Auberlen (C. A.)—The Divine Revelation. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Bannerman (Professor)—The Church of Christ: A Treatise on the Nature, Powers, Ordinances, Discipline, and Government of the Christian Church. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Baumgarten (Professor)—Apostolic History; Being an Account of the Development of the Early Church in the form of a Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Three vols. 8vo, 27s.

Beck (J. T., D.D.)—Outlines of Biblical Psychology. Crown 8vo, 4s.

Bengel—Gnomon of the New Testament. With Original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Five vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 31s. 6d. *Cheaper Edition, the five volumes bound in three,* 24s.

Besser (Dr. Rudolph)—Biblical Studies on St. John's Gospel. Two vols. crown 8vo, 12s.

Bleek (Professor)—An Introduction to the New Testament. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Bruce (A. B., D.D.)—The Training of the Twelve; or, Exposition of Passages in the Gospels exhibiting the Twelve Disciples of Jesus under Discipline for the Apostleship. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— The Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects. (Sixth Series of Cunningham Lectures.) 8vo, 12s.

Brown (David, D.D.)—Christ's Second Coming: Will it be Pre-Millennial? Sixth Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Buchanan (Professor)—The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of its History in the Church, and of its Exposition from Scripture, with special reference to recent attacks on the Theology of the Reformation. (Second Series of Cunningham Lectures.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— On Comfort in Affliction. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

——— On Improvement of Affliction. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Bungener (Felix)—Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Calvin—His Life, Labours, and Writings. By Felix Bungener. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

——— Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Two vols. 8vo, 14s.

Calvini Institutio Christianæ Religionis. Curavit A. Tholuck. Two vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 14s.

Caspari (C. E.)—A Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ. 8vo, 9s.

Caspers (A.)—The Footsteps of Christ. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Cave (Alfred, B.A.)—The Scripture Doctrine of Sacrifice. Demy 8vo, 12s.

Christlieb (Dr.)—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth. Third Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Cousin (Victor)—Lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. Post 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Cremer (Professor)—Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Second Edition, demy 4to, 25s.

Cunningham (Principal)—Sermons by the late Wm. Cunningham, D.D., Principal and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh. 8vo, 9s.

——— Reformers and Theology of the Reformation. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Discussions on Church Principles. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Historical Theology. A Review of the Principal Doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age. Second Edition, Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Curtiss (Dr. S. I.)—The Levitical Priests. A Contribution to the Criticism of the Pentateuch. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Dabney (R. L., D.D.)—The Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century Considered. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Davidson (Professor)—An Introductory Hebrew Grammar. With Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing. Third Edition, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.)—HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND CHIEFLY. Translated from the Fourth Revised Edition of the German by EVELINA MOORE. Vol. I., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

[*Vol. II. shortly.*

Harless (Dr. C. A.)—SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Havernick (H. A. Ch.)—GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Heard (Rev. J. B., M.A.)—THE TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN—SPIRIT, SOUL, AND BODY—applied to Illustrate and Explain the Doctrine of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. With an Appendix on the Fatherhood of God. Fourth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

Hefele (Bishop)—A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH. Vol. I. (Second Edition), to A.D. 325; Vol. II., A.D. 326 to 429. 8vo, 12s. each.

Hengstenberg (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. Three vols. 8vo, 33s.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. To which are appended: Treatises on the Song of Solomon; on the Book of Job; on the Prophet Isaiah; on the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture; and on the Jews and the Christian Church. 8vo, 9s.

——— THE PROPHECIES OF THE PROPHET EZEKIEL ELUCIDATED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— DISSERTATIONS ON THE GENUINENESS OF DANIEL, AND THE INTEGRITY OF ZECHARIAH. 8vo, 12s.

——— HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: A Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. Second Edition, Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Janet (Paul)—FINAL CAUSES. By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute. Translated from the French by WILLIAM AFFLECK, B.D. Demy 8vo, 12s.

Jouffroy—PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Kant—THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Keil (Professor)—BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE PENTATEUCH. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Keil (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON EZRA, NEHEMIAH, AND ESTHER. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON DANIEL. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF THE MINOR PROPHETS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— MANUAL OF HISTORICO-CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Killen (Professor)—THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH; or, The History, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of the Christians, traced from the Apostolic Age to the Establishment of the Pope as a Temporal Sovereign, A.D. 755. 8vo, 9s.

Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of Christ. Eighth Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL: A Portrait drawn from Bible History and the Book of Psalms. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Edited by his Daughter. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Kurtz (Professor)—HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY. Two vols. 8vo, 15s.

——— HISTORY OF THE OLD COVENANT. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Lange (J. P., D.D.)—THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST: A Complete Critical Examination of the Origin, Contents, and Connection of the Gospels. Edited, with additional Notes, by MARCUS DODS, D.D. Second Edition, in Four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 28s.

——— COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. (*The volume on* NUMBERS *and* DEUTERONOMY, *completing the Series, will shortly be published.*) To purchasers of a Complete Set of either Old or New Testament the price is 15s. per volume. Non-Subscribers, 21s. per volume. In 24 vols. imperial 8vo.

——— COMMENTARY, THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL, ON THE GOSPELS OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. Two vols. 8vo, 18s.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Lisco (F. G.)—PARABLES OF JESUS EXPLAINED AND ILLUSTRATED. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Luthardt, Kahnis, and Bruckner—THE CHURCH: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Luthardt (Professor)—ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. 8vo, 9s.

——— ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED ACCORDING TO ITS PECULIAR CHARACTER. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE FUNDAMENTAL (*Fifth Edition*), SAVING (*Third Edition*), MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY (*Second Edition*). Three vols. crown 8vo, 6s. each.

M'Lauchlan (T., D.D., LL.D.)—THE EARLY SCOTTISH CHURCH. The Ecclesiastical History of Scotland from the First to the Middle of the Twelfth Century. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Macdonald (Rev. Donald)—INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH: An Inquiry, Critical and Doctrinal, into the Genuineness, Authority, and Design of the Mosaic Writings. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE CREATION AND FALL: A Defence of the First Three Chapters of Genesis. 8vo, 12s.

Martensen (Bishop)—CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS: A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— CHRISTIAN ETHICS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Matheson (Geo., M.A., B.D.)—GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY, from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Meyer (Dr.)—CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s. [*Vol. II. shortly.*

——— ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— ON ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— ON CORINTHIANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s. [*Vol. II. shortly.*

——— ON GALATIANS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— ON PHILIPPIANS AND COLOSSIANS. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Morgan (James, D.D.)—THE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE HOLY SPIRIT. 8vo, 9s.

——— EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN. 8vo, 9s.

Müller (Dr. Julius)—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN. An entirely New Translation from the Fifth German Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01012 4677